



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2007

No. 43

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEEKS of New York).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 13, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGORY W. MEEKS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for 5 minutes.

IRAQ

Mr. PENCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By the end of 2006, most Americans could see that our strategy in Iraq was not working. In January of this year, President Bush outlined his plan to win the war in Iraq. And just last week, Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat majority announced their plan to end the war in Iraq. The only problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that, as George Orwell wrote, the quickest way to end the war is to lose it, and I believe that the Democratic plan to micromanage

our war in Iraq with benchmarks and deadlines for withdrawal is a prescription for retreat and defeat.

Common sense and the Constitution teach us that Congress can declare war. Congress can fund or choose not to fund war. But Congress must not ever attempt to conduct war. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to heed the call of the Constitution and common sense and reject the Pelosi plan for retreat and defeat in Iraq.

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, that I am actually not alone in my concern about the constitutionality and the common-sense value of the current plan for withdrawal from Iraq being propounded by the majority. The newspaper of record in the home State of Speaker PELOSI, the Los Angeles Times, wrote an editorial yesterday under the title "Do We Really Need a General Pelosi?" adding "Congress can cut funding for Iraq, but it shouldn't micromanage the war." Allow me to quote further from yesterday's lead editorial in the Los Angeles Times:

"After weeks of internal strife, House Democrats have brought forth their proposal for forcing President Bush to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq by 2008. The plan is an unruly mess: bad public policy, bad precedent and bad politics. If the legislation passes, Bush says he'll veto it, as well he should."

The Los Angeles Times editorial board went on:

"It was one thing for the house to pass a nonbinding vote of disapproval. It's quite another for it to set out a detailed timetable with specific benchmarks and conditions for the continuation of the conflict."

The L.A. Times asked, "Imagine if Dwight Eisenhower had been forced to adhere to a congressional war plan in scheduling the Normandy landings or if, in 1863, President Lincoln had been forced by Congress to conclude the Civil War by the following year."

They conclude, "This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in mili-

tary strategy," adding, "By interfering with the discretion of the Commander in Chief and military leaders in order to fulfill domestic political needs, Congress undermines whatever prospects remain of a successful outcome."

And even in today's Washington Post, another lion of the liberal media in America, under the lead editorial headline, The Pelosi Plan for Iraq, they write:

"In short, the Democrat proposal to be taken up this week is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard to the war itself."

The Washington Post adds: "Congress should rigorously monitor the Iraqi government's progress on those benchmarks. By Mr. Bush's own account, the purpose of the troop surge in Iraq is to enable political process. If progress does not occur, the military strategy should be reconsidered."

But here is the key line in the Washington Post lead editorial today: "But aggressive oversight is quite different from mandating military steps according to an inflexible timetable conforming to the need to capture votes in Congress or at the 2008 polls."

It is truly extraordinary how politics and common sense and the Constitution can make such strange bedfellows. I scarcely think, Mr. Speaker, that I have ever come to the floor of this House and quoted at any length the lead editorial in either the Washington Post or the Los Angeles Times. Those two newspapers tend to bookend the country from a liberal perspective in the media. But in both cases, both newspapers have identified what I asserted in the beginning, that my colleagues should heed the call of the Constitution and common sense and reject the Pelosi plan for retreat and defeat in Iraq.

It is the purview of the Congress to declare war. It is the purview of this Congress to vote up or down on whether we should continue to fund military

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2439

operations. And I would never question that right. But it is not the purview of the Congress, according to our history and Constitution and tradition, to interpose our will, our decisions, our timetables, on military commanders in the field.

I will close, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying that we do have but one choice in Iraq and that is victory. It is my hope and prayer that after much political debate here in Congress, we will give our soldiers the resources they need to achieve victory in Iraq and bring home a much-deserved freedom for those good people and another victory for freedom for the American people.

TIME TO REFOCUS EFFORTS IN THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my intention this morning was to come here and talk about the need to refocus our efforts in the war against terrorism out of Iraq and towards Afghanistan, because, after all, when we were attacked on 9/11, those who attacked us came from Afghanistan, not from Iraq. And President Bush in the very beginning and even now continues to confuse the American people by suggesting that the Iraq war had something to do with 9/11, which it did not.

However, I just listened to my colleague on the Republican side and I have to respond to him somewhat before I move on to the issue of Afghanistan. I want to commend the Speaker and commend the Democratic leadership for the supplemental appropriation bill that they are putting together and that will likely come to the floor next week. It was clear in the November election that the American people want a new direction in Iraq. They realize that the war in Iraq was begun for the wrong reasons, that it was not a response to 9/11, that a lot of the information that was provided to this Congress when the vote was taken to authorize the war was misleading and inaccurate. The fact of the matter is that Congress does have the power to declare war and Congress also has the decision as to whether to fund the war. And this is a supplemental appropriations bill that is going to fund the war and provide the funding for the troops. But at the same time Congress needs to point out that this war needs to move in a new direction and that it is not acceptable to simply give the President a blank check and say, okay, you can move ahead with your surge and essentially escalate the war.

We had a majority in this Congress, including a significant number of Republicans, who just a couple of weeks

ago voted on a resolution that said that the escalation and the surge was a mistake, that we are opposed to that. And so there has to be some effort in this spending bill, which is our prerogative, to indicate why the war has gone in the wrong direction and what needs to be done to end it and ultimately get our troops out of there. That is what we are doing as Democrats and I believe we will have a consensus to achieve that and I think that it will lead in a very short period of time to us getting out of Iraq and leaving the Iraqis to decide their own fate. It is time for that at this time. We shouldn't be sending the resources and we shouldn't be sending our soldiers into a situation where they no longer belong.

My intention today was to come to the floor and talk about, rather than sending our soldiers to Iraq and all the resources we are sending to Iraq, that we should be focusing more on Afghanistan, because that's where the Taliban were and they continue to be. That is where al Qaeda began and continues to exist, including those who were in charge of al Qaeda. And we are not doing enough in Afghanistan. There is a new offensive now on the part of the Taliban which began last month in February and we are trying to counteract that. But we're not focusing on that because we're spending too much time focusing on Iraq in terms of our resources and our troops.

Now, the President finally came to the realization a few weeks ago that this was the case and he started to talk more about what we needed to do in Afghanistan. He sent Vice President CHENEY there. Vice President CHENEY made the point. He also went to Pakistan because Pakistan has this border area where we believe al Qaeda and the Taliban are headquartered and where they simply hide out and regroup before they begin their attacks from Pakistan into Afghanistan. Vice President CHENEY went to Pakistan as well and made the point to President Musharraf that this is unacceptable, you cannot continue to harbor these terrorists, you have to do something to make sure that they are driven out of Pakistan and that they are not being supported by those local authorities or those within the intelligence service in Afghanistan that seem to be providing support to al Qaeda and to the Taliban.

But we need to focus on the issue of Afghanistan in terms of our resources, not only in terms of our troops but also in terms of reconstruction efforts. The Taliban are essentially being financed by increased production of opium and ultimately, of course, heroin. That's how they are financed. We need to deal with local reconstruction projects that will allow the Afghans and particularly the farmers to do things that are not related to the opium trade so they can grow crops other than opium and sustain themselves. This is a major effort that we have to concentrate on and not enough is happening.

I would point out that in the supplemental appropriations bill, we do provide more money for this effort, because the Democratic leadership, as Speaker PELOSI realized, that we are neglecting the war in Afghanistan where the terrorists began. Let's refocus on that. But this supplemental bill is the answer to the problem and it brings us in a new direction.

ENERGY SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 2002, in a Wall Street Journal editorial, former CIA Director James Woolsey described the central challenge we face in the global war on terrorism as the United States' dependence on imported oil. My colleagues, this dependence is providing our enemy with so much leverage that defeating terrorism has become significantly harder.

Let me quote from Mr. Woolsey: "We are at war. We should start by asking what we can do as soon as possible to undercut our enemies' power. Other considerations should now follow, not lead. If we do not act now, we will leave major levers over our fate in the hands of regimes that have attacked us or have fallen under the sway of fanatics who spread hatred of the United States and, indeed, of freedom itself. For all of them, their power derives from their oil. It is time to break their sword."

In order for the United States to effectively fight global terrorism and win in Iraq, we must first reduce our dangerous dependence on imported oil. Energy is the lifeblood of the United States and global economy. U.S. economic prosperity is closely tied to the availability of reliable and affordable supplies of energy. Since 1973, U.S. energy production has grown only 13 percent, while U.S. energy consumption has increased 30 percent. Even when significant increases in efficiency are taken into account, significant increases in demand are projected.

According to the Energy Information Agency, the United States, by 2025, is expected to need 44 percent more petroleum, 38 percent more natural gas, 43 percent more coal and 54 percent more electricity. The Department of Energy predicts by the year 2025, U.S. oil and natural gas demand will rise by 46 percent, with energy demand increasing 1 percent for every 2 percent increase in GDP.

Perhaps the most critical of all energy sources is oil. Just as President Bush said in his 2006 State of the Union speech, America is addicted to oil. A look at the numbers supports his claim. Currently, the United States imports about 60 percent of its oil. The Department of Energy projects this number will increase to 73 percent by

the year 2025. Furthermore, world oil demand is expected to grow significantly over the next three decades, from 80 million barrels per day in 2003 to 98 million barrels per day in 2015 and then to 118 million barrels per day by the year 2030, according to the Energy Information Administration. This will place further strains on our quest for energy independence. To make matters worse, much of this imported oil is imported from unstable, anti-American countries, such as Venezuela, Algeria, and even Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, 26.5 percent of the United States' total supplied product comes from OPEC countries, accounting for 42 percent of the total amount imported. Thus, over a quarter of the United States oil product is controlled by an unaccountable cartel of unstable, oil-producing dictatorships.

Alarming, according to the Heritage Foundation, three-quarters of the world's supply of oil is controlled by unstable or hostile regimes, most of which are unsympathetic to investor and property rights. Fifty-seven percent of world oil reserves are in the Middle East, 11 percent in Russia and Venezuela and 6 percent in Africa. The People's Republic of China just erected its first oil rigs in Cuba territorial waters in the Gulf of Mexico, barely 45 miles off the Florida coast of Miami.

The national security implications of having such a large amount of oil controlled by OPEC are great and serious. For example, in order to force changes in U.S. policy, OPEC countries could cut production, thereby raising the price of oil. The resulting political and economic pressure could force us to alter our policies in order to better suit the needs of these OPEC nations. U.S. dependence on imported sources of oil and gas has far-reaching economic and national security ramifications.

Some are willing to use oil as a tool to threaten United States national security objectives. Proclamations by al Qaeda and other terrorist groups that U.S. and western economies and their oil lifelines are legitimate targets make it clear that the oil and gas infrastructure is in peril. As James Woolsey said, we are aiding our enemies at the same time we are fighting them.

TOWARD A MORE ENERGY EFFICIENT FUTURE WITHOUT BEING PRICE-GOUGED ON WAY THERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the Chair.

I am going to continue the discussion the previous Member started with perhaps a little different orientation and, that is, our dependence upon oil. I would agree with the gentleman that we need to break our dependence upon imported oil. We need to look toward a more energy-efficient future. That is going to mean new sources of energy,

new technologies. I am on a number of bills to make those investments. But more immediately, I want to talk about the situation we are in today. On the path to that more energy-efficient future, we don't need to be fleeced by the oil cartels, which is what is going on now. I am not just talking about OPEC but I'll get to them in a moment, but I'm getting to the big oil companies—ExxonMobil, record profits last year, \$3.2 billion a month, \$40 billion for the year, \$109 million a day, \$4.6 million an hour of profits for one corporation. Throughout the industry, it was repeated.

Now, the President, an oil man, a failed oil man, and the Vice President from Halliburton, another oil man, say there's nothing they can do about it, nothing the government can do about it. This is just market forces. Market forces.

Hmm. Let's see. You make gasoline out of crude oil so if the price of crude oil goes up, the price of gasoline goes up. Yeah, I understand that. That's good. The price of crude oil is up a whopping 3 percent over last year. That is about inflation. That's not too bad. That's today on the market. Unfortunately, the price of gasoline on the west coast is up 20 percent. Now, where did the rest of that market force come into play?

No, what we have here, plain and simple, is price gouging, market manipulation and collusion. A number of years ago there was a famous memo in the industry that said, you know, the refineries are not particularly profitable, but if the industry were to engage in mergers, buy out the independent refiners, close them down and decrease the refinery capacity in America, that could become a very profitable sector. It is. In fact, profits in the refining sector because of collusion by Big Oil are up 250 percent. It isn't the guy at the corner gas station who's making the money. It's the corporate execs in a vertically integrated industry which they're manipulating. The same way that Enron manipulated the energy markets in California to drive up the price, Big Oil is doing it and they're doing it in the western United States right today and across America. They're building up toward that orgy of price gouging that happens every year around Memorial Day and during the summer driving season. And they say, "Oh, these are just market forces." These are not market forces and this government needs to address this in a number of ways.

We need to file a complaint against OPEC. The gentleman before me mentioned them. They get together, they collude, they decide to constrain the price and drive up the price of crude oil. That's where this all starts. Well, it just happens that a number of the major OPEC producers are in the World Trade Organization. Our President, a big free trader, wants rules-based trade. Well, guess what, the rules don't allow OPEC to do that. But will this

President file a complaint against OPEC? No. I have written to him a number of times and said, President Bush, they're violating the World Trade Organization. File a complaint. People complain about the United States there all the time. Why don't we use that tool to benefit our consumers. No, the President refuses to do that. My bill would force the President to file legitimate complaints and break up the OPEC cartel. That would help. But then we have got to go after the big oil companies themselves. Impose a windfall profits tax on these companies, unless they are investing in expanding refinery capacity—which they cut in order to increase the profitability—exploration or alternative fuels. Make our vehicles more efficient. Give incentives to consumers to buy more efficient vehicles. Mandate new fleet fuel economy standards. Put a ban on more mergers by the oil industry. In fact, my bill would name a commission to investigate the market power of Big Oil and maybe we have to think about breaking them up and turning this back into a somewhat competitive industry.

Yes, we need to move toward a more energy-efficient future, but we don't need to be price-gouged on the way to that goal. And that's what is happening today.

So I am introducing a package of bills oriented toward market manipulation, price gouging by Big Oil and OPEC, and also bills that would give consumers an incentive and actually help consumers to purchase more efficient vehicles in the interim and also push Detroit and other manufacturers toward making more efficient vehicles. They won't go there until we push them. We had a big fight over fleet fuel economy standards. I am very sympathetic to American workers. I remember the guys in from Ford, and they said, You don't understand. The execs told us, if you make them make more efficient vehicles, they'll lay us off. Guess what: They all got laid off because Ford didn't make more efficient vehicles.

It's time for some action on the part of this Congress and this government to defend American consumers and lead us toward a more energy-efficient future without being price-gouged on the way there.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, You see all things as they truly are. You understand each of us with our human limitations and unique perspectives. In You is reality. For us all is relativity.

Not to be able to sing is one thing; but not to be able to speak or know the common language is something else.

Not to be able to run a marathon is one thing; but not to be able to stand up or walk is something else.

Not to be able to memorize a passage of Scripture or a speech is one thing; but not to be able to remember yesterday is quite another.

Lord God, help each of us accept our limitations and use whatever our capabilities are to do good and bring joy to others. By honestly admitting our own frailties, empower us to accept the differences of others and reach out to them with greater understanding.

Make us a nation who cares for its wounded, who welcomes the immigrant and who looks out for those with disabilities in every possible way both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BISHOP led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

LET'S END THE WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. A very simple proposition is facing this House; do we keep the war in Iraq going or do we end it? Do we use the money to bring the troops home or do we use the money to keep them in Iraq?

The lives of our troops are on the line. The war cannot be won militarily. Why do we stay? Why do we tell our troops to keep fighting? Who is going to explain to the families of the troops the consequences of Congress' decision? And why isn't our Democratic Party taking the leadership to immediately end the war? We can do it. We don't have to give the administration another \$120 billion to keep the war going. We don't have to let more troops die and have more civilian casualties.

My bill, H.R. 1234, provides a path to bringing our troops home, ending the occupation, closing our bases and stops the occupation of Iraq. We do not have to keep funding this war. The money is in the pipeline to bring the troops home. Let's end the war, bring the troops home, and bring in international peacekeepers to stabilize Iraq. We can do it once we end the occupation.

CHILD KILLER

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, today is judgment day. A quiet voice is crying from the grave for justice; it is the voice of a 9-year-old girl named Jessica Lunsford.

Jessica was kidnapped in the middle of the night from her home by a professional child molester; his name is John Couey. The criminal abused Jessica for several days and then buried her alive in his backyard. When found, Jessica had poked her tiny fingers through the plastic bag seeking air. Last week, a jury convicted the child killer of capital murder and the punishment hearing begins today in Florida. The State is seeking the death penalty.

Mr. Speaker, evil doesn't get much worse than stealing, abusing and murdering little girls. Society cannot allow this type of conduct to occur. Society can only eliminate it. The punishment assessed on this criminal will set a price for this dastardly act. Hopefully the good people of Florida will, by their verdict, say to all child killers, leave our children alone or face an early meeting with your maker.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT IS BACK IN THE HOUSE

(Mr. WALZ of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental part of human nature that people will do high-quality work when somebody is keeping an eye on their performance. Businesses need accountants, schools need principals and school boards. Appropriate management and a vigilant watchdog can prevent serious problems and keep things running effectively and efficiently.

Well, for 6 years our Federal Government has gone without congressional oversight. This administration has had free rein to do what it pleased, no matter what the consequences. The results simply speak for themselves. Walter Reed, Hurricane Katrina, Iraq.

This is all beginning to change. Under Democratic control, the Congress has finally once again assumed its oversight responsibility. Already, in just 3 months we have had 91 full committee hearings, with 73 more planned. In addition, this week the House will

consider a series of measures to ensure the Federal Government is open and accountable to the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, this congressional oversight is exactly what the people of southern Minnesota asked for, transparent and accountable government for the people. As I campaigned across the First District, I promised to do everything with my colleagues to make this happen, and this week it continues on.

THE PELOSI PLAN FOR IRAQ

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has usually been associated with the Democratic Party. Today's lead editorial is especially courageous in criticizing the Democratic plan for Iraq.

I would like to draw to your attention the following: "In short, the Democratic proposal being taken up this week is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself. Will Iraq collapse into unrestrained civil conflict with massive civilian casualties, as the U.S. intelligence community predicts, in the event of rapid withdrawal? Will al Qaeda establish a powerful new base for launching attacks on the United States and its allies? Ms. PELOSI's strategy leads not toward a responsible withdrawal from Iraq, but to a constitutional struggle with Mr. Bush, who has already said he will veto the legislation."

Members of both parties should acknowledge the point of this editorial. Al Qaeda spokesman for Osama bin Laden, al-Zawahiri, has clearly identified that Iraq and Afghanistan are the central fronts in the global war on terrorism. To undermine Iraq as clearly part of a global war puts American families at risk.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT
DEMOCRATS DELIVER WITH LEGISLATION THIS WEEK

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year Democrats pledged to make Congress an open and accountable process to the American people. This week the House will consider a series of reform measures that deliver on that promise.

This week we will vote on legislation reforming the Freedom of Information Act, requiring a more timely disclosure of government documents, and another bill that nullifies the 2001 Presidential executive order so that the access to Presidential records is finally restored. Both of these important bills open up government to the American people so that they can hold their government accountable.

Finally, the House will debate a bill providing real oversight of government contracts by limiting how long Federal no-bid contracts can last and requiring agencies to minimize the use of no-bid contracts.

Real oversight will return to Washington, and this week we will pass important legislation that brings real accountability along with it.

NINTH CIRCUIT—JUDICIAL ACTIVISM

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, for years the Federal courts have drifted towards judicial activism, and nowhere is this dangerous trend more fully embraced than the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Based in San Francisco and covering nine western States, the Ninth Circuit has given us some of the more outrageous decisions in recent memory. These are the folks who say the words "under God" are unconstitutional in our pledge. Fortunately for our Nation and our Constitution this mostly Democrat-appointed court isn't the last defense against judicial activism. The U.S. Supreme Court regularly reviews the Ninth Circuit's rulings, and not surprisingly, the high court often overturns them. In fact, in this term the Supreme Court has overturned every Ninth Circuit ruling it has taken up. If you break it out by the votes of the individual Justices, the score is 67 votes to overturn and just five votes to uphold. These are definitely second-string back benchers. It is time they begin interpreting the Constitution, not rewriting it.

IRAQ

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deepest concern for the situation that is worsening in Iraq.

March 19 of this year will mark the fifth year of war, and still Vice President CHENEY states that the Democratic strategy toward Iraq validates al Qaeda's agenda. This comment really means that anyone that disagrees with him gets accused of this issue.

Terrorists instill fear in their enemies, and it is this fear that generates self-defeating behavior. It is this fear that led the American people to believe that war was a validated solution, and still try to link it to September 11. It is this fear that has cost the United States billions of dollars on Iraq reconstruction plans, while neglecting our own system.

OPPOSING THE DEMOCRATIC SUPPLEMENTAL ACT

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is said that politicians live in the past and statesmen vote for the future. Indeed, the options that we have today, both militarily and diplomatic, are based on votes that were taken by Congress 10 or 15 years ago.

The supplemental act recently unveiled by the Democratic majority appears to have been written by politicians, not statesmen. It includes the postponement of the acquisition of two F-35 fighter aircraft, which by itself does not seem too significant, but it bespeaks an attitude to be feared. For when we postpone the acquisition of technologically advanced military equipment, we place the future air superiority, something we have had since the Korean War and take for granted, in jeopardy. When we divert dollars from one branch of the military to support another branch of the military, we place all of the military in jeopardy. All four branches of the military deserve to be fully and adequately funded, and that is something this supplemental does not do.

This supplemental simply starts us down the road to a place where a future Congress will look back and criticize us for our failure to be statesmen.

SUPPORTING THE DEMOCRATIC SUPPLEMENTAL ACT

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, last fall the American people went to the polls and they voted for positive change and new direction, not only in the way we do business here in Washington, but also in Iraq. The 110th Congress is fulfilling the mandate the American people provided by putting forward a supplemental bill that will guarantee three things: First, support for our troops before, during and after being in harm's way; second, accountability and responsibility, not only from our own administration, but from the newly elected Iraqi government as well; and, third, a positive change away from Iraq and back towards al Qaeda by guaranteeing an end to our involvement in the civil war in Iraq.

The American people will no longer write blank checks to this administration, and neither will this Congress; nor will we continue to send our sons and daughters to the sands of Iraq in an open-ended commitment. The time has come for this administration to listen to the will of the people.

The American people demanded new leadership, positive change and a new direction, and that is exactly what this Congress is delivering.

□ 1215

BALANCE THE BUDGET WITHOUT RAISING TAXES

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, simply chasing higher spending with higher taxes, as the Democrats want, will fail to address the unsustainable growth of government spending. We must balance the budget without tax increases.

Part of the Republican plan is to make permanent the tax relief that continues to support our Nation's economic prosperity. Our pro-growth policies have worked to support our economy's solid sustained growth and have created more than 7.4 million new jobs. This growth has also fueled double-digit growth in Federal revenues and put us on a path to balancing the budget.

The Democrat plan would simply reverse this progress with job-killing automatic tax increases.

The Republican plan also includes reforms to unsustainable entitlement programs so they can meet the mounting challenges and obligations of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the American people elected us to find solutions, not create more problems. I urge my colleagues to work with the Republicans to implement these real and workable solutions for a more fiscally responsible tomorrow.

WALTER REED AND NEED TO TAKE CARE OF OUR WOUNDED SOLDIERS

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, since The Washington Post broke the story on Building 18 at Walter Reed, we have heard similar stories of unacceptably bad conditions at other facilities around the country. While The Post should be commended for bringing the information to this Nation, it should never have gotten to this point. Last week, we also learned that some Republican colleagues knew of these conditions and basically did nothing. This response of doing nothing is not acceptable.

Rather than inquiring about such bad conditions and deciding to do something, they choose to brush it off and basically bring it under the table. And rather than finding out who was responsible for the housing of our troops that had mold, that had mice and cockroaches, the administration chose to look the other way.

Doing nothing is not acceptable. Last week, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, which I sit on, held hearings, and will continue to hold hearings, on the treatment of our wounded soldiers throughout this country. We want to see the widespread problems that exist corrected, and we recognize the seriousness. It is time for us to do the right thing for our soldiers.

CONGRESS SHOULD REJECT DEMOCRATIC PLAN ON IRAQ

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, in January, President Bush described his plan to win the war in Iraq, and last week Speaker PELOSI described her plan to end the war in Iraq. The only problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is, as George Orwell said, the quickest way to end a war is to lose it; and I believe the Democrat plan to micromanage our war in Iraq with benchmarks and deadlines for withdrawal is just that, a prescription for retreat and defeat.

But common sense and the Constitution teach us that Congress can declare war, we can fund or choose not to fund a war, but Congress should never attempt to conduct war. In fact, this is a broadly held view by some of the leading arteries of America's traditionally liberal media. The L.A. Times yesterday said: "Congress can cut funding for Iraq, but it shouldn't micromanage the war." In The Washington Post today, the lead editorial entitled "The Pelosi Plan For Iraq" said: "In short, the Democrat proposal is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard to the war itself."

I commend these American newspapers for their sensible reasoning. Common sense and the Constitution demand Congress should reject the Pelosi plan.

CBO SAYS PRESIDENT'S BUDGET WILL NOT REACH BALANCE IN 2012

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released a primary analysis of the President's fiscal 2008 budget and found that the administration would fall short of its claim of balancing the Federal budget by 2012 without raising taxes. This contradicts comments made by the President when he unveiled the budget last month and claimed that his budget will be balanced by 2012 without raising taxes.

According to the CBO report, the President's budget will run a \$9 billion deficit just 5 years from now. That report also concludes that the President's budget will lead to higher taxes for millions of middle-class Americans. First, his budget only includes a 1-year tax fix for the alternative minimum tax, which will lead to a \$247 billion tax increase on middle-class families over the next 5 years. Then the President's health care plan will result in a tax increase of \$500 billion over the next 10 years on middle-class families. This is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the President levels with the American people about the budget that he proposed a month ago.

CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS STILL WILLING TO PROVIDE PRESIDENT BUSH RUBBER STAMP ON WAR

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the American people are demanding a change of direction in Iraq, congressional Republicans are more than willing to provide the President another blank check to continue the status quo.

After 4 years of incompetent planning and bad projections, it is time that Congress hold both the Iraqi Government and the Bush administration accountable. And yet Republican leaders continue to say we should just give the President what he wants, no questions asked. That is what the old Republican-controlled Congress did six times.

Later this month, the House is going to have a choice: give the President another blank check to move ahead with the status quo in Iraq, or take the war in a new direction. The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans Health and Accountability Act is that new direction. Far from being micromanagement, as many Republicans call it, this legislation sets policy for equipping our troops, policy for refocusing the war on terror, and policy for a responsible redeployment.

I urge all of my colleagues to seriously consider this change in direction.

CONGRESS CANNOT AFFORD TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT ANOTHER BLANK CHECK ON IRAQ

(Mr. ARCURI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, after 4 years, billions of dollars and thousands of lives lost, we simply cannot reward failure with a blank check in the war in Iraq. I refuse to rubber-stamp more failed policies.

In the weeks ahead, we have the opportunity as representatives of the people to change the direction in Iraq without jeopardizing the safety and well-being of our troops. We must finally require Iraqis to take control of their own country and their own destiny.

The President has threatened to veto legislation that contains his own benchmarks for success in Iraq; provides our troops with the training and equipment they need; and ensures that when our brave soldiers return home, they get the kind of care that they deserve. Our legislation also commits additional funds to fight the forgotten war in Afghanistan and against al Qaeda, strengthening our national security.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New York's 24th District sent me here to address the war in Iraq and to start this country on a long overdue new direction for America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Alabama). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

REAUTHORIZING UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1003) to amend the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 to reauthorize the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1003

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking "October 1, 2006" and inserting "October 1, 2009".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

This legislation extends the mandate of an important bipartisan panel created by Congress, appointed by the President and working on behalf of the American people. This group keeps a watchful eye on major efforts by the private sector and the U.S. Government to inform and to influence opinions overseas and to improve America's understanding of other lands.

Since September 11, 2001, such efforts, known collectively as "public diplomacy," have been recognized as an integral part of our country's work to foster better relations with people abroad. Congress created the predecessor of this panel more than half a century ago. Now it is called the United States Advisory Commission on

Public Diplomacy, and it deserves our sustained and enthusiastic support.

The commission regularly delivers its findings and makes recommendations to the President, the Congress, the Secretary of State and the general public with easily accessible reports. These reports also include assessments of the scholarly integrity and political neutrality of the cultural and educational exchange programs of the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy does good and important work. Its mandate should be extended not merely annually, but for nearly 3 years more, as our legislation ensures. I am proud to be the author of this legislation, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this short, but important, bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the gentlelady's work on this bill. The legislation before us today reauthorizes the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy through fiscal year 2009. Unique among nations, the United States maintains a vast network of formal and informal contacts with the people of the world and conducts the world's only global foreign policy.

The purpose of public diplomacy is to provide this worldwide audience with information about the United States and to convey an accurate and positive image of our beloved country and our foreign policy objectives. To accomplish this mission, the United States Government has at its disposal a number of important tools, including education and cultural exchange programs, extensive and proactive public affairs programs centered in our embassies, and a network of radio and television services broadcasting accurate and objective programming to a world community.

With H.R. 1003, Congress is reauthorizing the advisory commission for another 2 years to continue its important work to study our public diplomacy programs and reach some useful conclusions about how our government can do a better job of creating a dialogue with foreign audiences.

I urge the commission during the next 2 years to step up its efforts to study in more detail our public diplomacy and broadcasting efforts and advise policymakers in the administration and in Congress on appropriate changes and reforms that will improve our outreach efforts to the people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would again emphasize the importance of my bill and urge all of my colleagues to vote in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1003.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

CALLING FOR RELEASE OF ISRAELI SOLDIERS HELD CAP- TIVE BY HAMAS AND HEZBOLLAH

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 107) calling for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 107

Whereas Israel completed its withdrawal from southern Lebanon on May 24, 2000;

Whereas Congress previously expressed its concern for Israeli soldiers missing in Lebanon and Syrian-controlled territory of Lebanon in Public Law 106-89 (113 Stat. 1305; November 8, 1999), which required the Secretary of State to raise the status of missing Israeli soldiers with appropriate government officials of Syria, Lebanon, the Palestinian Authority, and other governments in the region, and to submit to Congress reports on those efforts and any subsequent discovery of relevant information;

Whereas on June 18, 2000, the United Nations Security Council welcomed and endorsed United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan's report that Israel had withdrawn completely from Lebanon under the terms of United Nations Security Council Resolution 425 (1978);

Whereas Israel completed its withdrawal from Gaza on September 12, 2005;

Whereas on June 25, 2006, Hamas and allied terrorists crossed into Israel to attack a military post, killing two soldiers and wounding a third, Gilad Shalit, who was kidnapped;

Whereas on July 12, 2006, Hezbollah terrorists crossed into Israel to attack Israeli troops patrolling the Israeli side of the border with Lebanon, killing three, wounding two, and kidnapping Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev;

Whereas Gilad Shalit has been held in captivity by Hamas for more than 7 months;

Whereas Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev have been held in captivity by Hezbollah for more than 6 months;

Whereas Hamas and Hezbollah have withheld all information on the health and welfare of the men they have kidnapped; and

Whereas, contrary to the most basic standards of humanitarian conduct, Hamas and Hezbollah have prevented access to the Israeli captives by competent medical personnel and representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) demands that—

(A) Hamas immediately and unconditionally release Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit;

(B) Hezbollah accept the mandate of United Nations Security Council Resolution

1701 (2006) by immediately and unconditionally releasing Israeli soldiers Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev; and

(C) Hezbollah and Hamas accede to the most basic standards of humanitarian conduct and allow prompt access to the Israeli captives by competent medical personnel and representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross;

(2) expresses—

(A) its vigorous support and unwavering commitment to the welfare and survival of the State of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state with secure borders;

(B) its strong support and deep interest in achieving a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through the creation of a viable and independent Palestinian state living in peace alongside of the State of Israel;

(C) its ongoing concern and sympathy for the families of Gilad Shalit, Ehud Goldwasser, and Eldad Regev and all other missing Israeli soldiers; and

(D) its full commitment to seek the immediate and unconditional release of the Israeli captives; and

(3) condemns—

(A) Hamas and Hezbollah for the cross border attacks and kidnappings which precipitated weeks of intensive armed conflict between Israel, Hezbollah, and armed Palestinian groups; and

(B) Iran and Syria, the primary state sponsors of global terrorism and the patrons of Hezbollah and Hamas, for their ongoing support for international terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Chairman TOM LANTOS and ranking minority member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, as well as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, MIKE PENCE. These Members joined with me at the very outset of the Congress to introduce H. Res. 107. The resolution is an exercise in compassion and it expresses the sense of the House regarding the three Israeli soldiers who were kidnapped last summer.

As of today, Gilad Shalit has been a captive for 261 days, roughly 8½ months; Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev have been captives for 244 days. That is a day more than 8 months. To date, there has been no access to these men by medical personnel or the Red Cross or Red Crescent.

They have not been permitted to send mail to their loved ones. We don't know if they are ill, we don't know if

they are wounded, we don't know for certain that they are still alive.

Mr. Speaker, their captors have sought to turn these three men into something they are not: Bargaining chips, pawns, a kind of political chattel, things that can be swapped for favors or sacrificed at whim. These three men are not things. They are human beings. They have names and families. They have rights as captured soldiers, and they have rights as individuals. And they also have rights under international law.

The organizations that have taken these men captive have shown their true character. Withholding doctors and medicine, withholding the Red Cross and Red Crescent visits, withholding basic communications with their families, even just the information that they are still alive, these choices and these acts show what kind of men run Hamas and Hezbollah: They are religious, but they are deeply immoral. They are self-righteous, but they are profoundly cruel. They are blustery and proud, but they are sneaky and manipulative. Decent human beings do not behave this way.

Mr. Speaker, decency doesn't depend on international law or multilateral agreements, nor does it depend on nationality. And I am not aware that withholding medical care or basic contact with the outside world is a requirement of either Shia or Sunni Islam, or any of the world's great religions.

This kind of brutality and malice is, unfortunately, typical of these organizations and their state sponsors, Syria and Iran. Syria is a thuggish dictatorship which believes its appetite for the Golan Heights legitimizes any crime or cruelty.

And Iran's repressive theocracy is both the world's leading sponsor of terrorism and its most dangerous proliferation threat. Viciousness is standard operating procedure for both regimes.

We cannot compel such parties to release Gilad, Ehud, and Eldad any more than we can force them to understand the difference between right and wrong. You cannot disgrace someone who is incapable of shame.

But we can and we must stand by our ally, the State of Israel. America has had painfully similar experiences at the hands of the same culprits.

Out of our own bitter experience, we can express our sympathy and our concern for the captives and for their families. We can let the perpetrators of this barbarism know that we have not forgotten what they have done, and what they are continuing to do. We can bear witness, and we can add our voices to all those who are saying, "Enough, enough. Let these men go home."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last July Israel's sovereign border was violated by terrorists

linked to Hamas who shot and killed two Israeli soldiers and kidnapped Corporal Gilad Shalit.

Days later, terrorists linked to Hezbollah crossed into Israel and killed three and wounded two, and kidnapped soldiers Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev. All three have been held captive since without medical attention from humanitarian groups like the Red Cross. No information is known on the fate of these soldiers.

As proxies of the Iranian and Syrian regimes, Hezbollah and Hamas have continued to attack Israel despite Israel's withdrawal from southern Lebanon in 2000 and Gaza in 2005.

Rather than view Israel's withdrawal as an act of good faith to further the cause of peace, Hezbollah and Hamas viewed these measures as signs of weaknesses to exploit. Hamas and Hezbollah, which have representatives in the Palestinian and Lebanese cabinets, believe that terrorism, murder and kidnapping are appropriate means of achieving political objectives, and have proposed negotiations to exchange these hostages for convicted terrorists now serving time in Israeli jails.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution which declares that the House of Representatives stands with the State of Israel and its right to self-defense and against the barbarity perpetrated by Hezbollah, Hamas and other terrorist groups, and the rogue regimes that sponsor them.

This resolution demands that Hamas and Hezbollah immediately and unconditionally release Mr. Shalit, Mr. Goldwasser and Mr. Regev, and that they provide all three with access to medical attention.

The resolution also holds Iran and Syria accountable for making terrorist acts like these possible. We cannot afford to be complacent about those Islamist extremists who would seek to kill three people, violate borders with impunity and threaten the security of the Middle East and the world.

As Dr. Martin Luther King noted, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

I thank Chairman ACKERMAN for introducing this resolution, his leadership in this area, and doing so much to advance the cause of the kidnapped Israeli soldiers. This resolution is about seeking what is needed most: Justice for the innocent and accountability for the guilty. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers. If the gentleman will yield back his time, we are prepared to do so.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Yes. Again, I reiterate how important to my colleagues it is that we pass this resolution and support it wholeheartedly, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his leadership and helping shepherd this on the floor today.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 107, which calls for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah.

On July 19, 2006, I and the three Members of Lebanese ancestry joined together to introduce H. Res. 926 in response to the unprovoked attack and kidnapping by Hezbollah. This resolution condemned Hamas and Hezbollah for engaging in the reprehensible terrorist act of taking hostages, affirmed Israel's right to conduct operations to secure the release of hostages, and urging the protection of innocent life and civilian infrastructure.

H. Res. 107 sends an important message that the terrorist leaders of Hamas and Hezbollah must recognize. The United States has not forgotten the kidnapped Israeli soldiers or those responsible for their kidnapping including the states who support the terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the record that this resolution expresses "strong support and deep interest in achieving a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through the creation of a viable and independent Palestinian state living in peace alongside of the State of Israel," as well as "vigorous support and unwavering commitment to the welfare and survival of the State of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state with secure borders."

While I fully support the commitment to the welfare and survival of the State of Israel, I have some reservations about this body expressing its support for a nation embracing a specific religious character. My concern is that in some situations, such expression of an endorsement of a particular religion or ethnicity could be used to exclude others which is, of course, not the intention of this resolution.

Both Israeli and Palestinian leaders have expressed their preference for a viable two-state solution and, as such, I support this joint goal and the independent peaceful aspirations of both peoples because the parties have made these decisions on their own and not because I support the preeminence of any particular religion.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah. As a former soldier myself, my thoughts and prayers are with Gilad Shalit, Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev and their families. Let them know that the strength and good wishes of this Congress and of our Nation are with them all.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution, which states in a clear, unequivocal voice that the United States stands with these brave soldiers and demands their immediate and unconditional release. The statement we make today is important not just for these three soldiers, but for the greater goal of achieving peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes it abundantly clear that neither the U.S., nor Israel, nor any of our allies will bow to the will of terrorist organizations. We will fight them at

every turn, we will never retreat, and we will prevail because the cause of freedom is just and righteous. As one of my heroes, President John F. Kennedy, once said, "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty." Today we renew this pledge.

This resolution also makes it clear that while we do not shrink from the fight against terrorism, we also recognize that this battle is one that cannot be won without diplomacy. While we declare that we will always support efforts to maintain Israel's identity as a Jewish state with secure borders, we also renew our commitment to achieving a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through the creation of a viable and independent Palestinian state living in peace alongside of the State of Israel.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we are here to speak in a united voice to support Gilad Shalit, Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev. We pray for their safety and we hope that they will return home soon. As we do this, we realize that the stories of these three brave soldiers are a part of a larger conflict that has taken thousands of lives and has ravaged an entire region of the world for far too long. With this resolution, we take another small step toward a future that is free of this conflict, where both Israelis and Palestinians have a place to call home and where no more lives are lost to a needless cycle of violence.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

I rise today to voice my strong support for H. Res. 107. This bipartisan resolution calls for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah.

I want to thank my friend from New York, Congressman GARY ACKERMAN, for introducing this resolution.

More than 7 months have passed since July of 2006, when Hamas terrorists crossed into Israel to attack a military post, killing two soldiers and wounding and kidnapping a third, Gilad Shalit.

Less than 1 month later, Hezbollah terrorists crossed into Israel and ambushed Israeli troops patrolling the border with Lebanon, killing three soldiers and kidnapping two, Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev.

These despicable acts occurred despite Israel's good faith efforts, which included its total withdrawal from southern Lebanon in May of 2000.

These two terrorist groups have withheld all information on the health and welfare of the men they have kidnapped. Defying the most basic standards of conduct, they have prevented medical personnel and members of the International Red Cross from having access to the kidnapped Israelis.

In spite of these terrorist attacks, the strength of the Israeli people has not wavered. In these difficult times, our support of Israel must not waver either.

The United States must stay committed to the welfare and survival of the State of Israel as a Jewish and democratic nation with secure borders.

Our Congress must stand in one voice and condemn Hamas and Hezbollah, and their primary sponsors, Iran and Syria, for these cross border attacks.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting Israel and condemning these heinous acts, and cast a vote in favor of H. Res. 107.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it's been more than seven months now and many have forgotten about the three Israeli soldiers kidnapped by Hamas and Hezbollah: Ehud Goldwasser, Eldad Regev, and Gilad Shalit. Hezbollah seems to have forgotten that last year's hostilities ended only after there were promises regarding the return of the Israeli men. This just goes to reinforce the fact that terrorist organizations cannot be negotiated with.

In 2004, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559 called for Hezbollah in Lebanon to disband. Despite a half-dozen statements from the Secretary-General, they continued to occupy the border region as UN observers looked on. We don't know for sure, but these very observers may have watched Hezbollah cross the border and kidnap Goldwasser and Regev.

Security Council Resolution 170, which ended the most recent conflict, again called for Hezbollah to disarm and return of the soldiers. They remain in Lebanon and Gaza and not even international organizations such as the Red Cross have been able to see them and be assured of their fair treatment.

Israel has demonstrated its commitment to the Resolution by ceasing hostilities and pulling back its soldiers, but yet again they are dealing with opponents who show disrespect to all and whose word cannot be trusted.

We stand together with Israel to call again for the unconditional release of these three men. We pray for their safe return and for peace between Israel and its neighbors. They will not be forgotten by their families, by their nation, or by this body.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 107, a resolution calling for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers Gilad Shalit, Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev, who continue to be held by the terror organizations Hamas and Hezbollah more than 6 months after being captured. These soldiers were kidnapped on Israeli soil in two separate, but equally brazen attacks, which were acts of war.

During their time in captivity, Hamas and Hezbollah, both of whom desire to simultaneously maintain an armed wing and a political wing, have not reported on the soldiers' health and have not granted access to international organizations to check on their well-being.

In August of last year, shortly after the fighting between Israeli forces and Hezbollah stopped, I visited Lebanon and northern Israel. While in Israel, we met with the families of the kidnapped soldiers. I cannot tell you how difficult it is, especially for a parent, to know a loved one is in harm's way and there is nothing you can do to help him.

It is so important this resolution is on the floor of the House today because we want the soldiers to know, we want their families to know, and we want Hamas and Hezbollah and the state sponsors of their terrorist activities—Iran and Syria to know that America has not forgotten the kidnappings that took place last summer. We will not forget this injustice until the soldiers are returned home to their families safe and sound.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker I rise today as a proud original cosponsor of

House Resolution 107, calling for the immediate and unconditional release of the Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah since last summer.

The critical bipartisan legislation being introduced today calls for the immediate and unconditional release of the three Israeli soldiers who were captured last summer. Ehud Goldwasser, 31, and Eldad Regev, 26, were kidnapped by Hezbollah on July 12, 2006. Gilad Shalit was kidnapped by Hamas on June 25, 2006.

Moreover, my cosponsorship of this legislation follows up on the July 29, 2006 letter I wrote to American Red Cross Interim President Jack McGuire urging the American Red Cross to apply pressure to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to look into the well-being of the three Israeli soldiers. My colleague, Canadian Senator Jerry S. Grafstein, wrote a similar letter.

To date, Gilad is the only captive Israeli soldier to have been confirmed to be alive by his captors. Hezbollah has not given any indication as to whether the other two Israeli soldiers they captured are injured or even still alive. Contrary to the most basic standards of humanitarian conduct, Hamas and Hezbollah have prevented access to all of the Israeli captives by representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

I and all in this country, resent terrorist groups who use human life as a strategic tool to further their radical agenda. In calling for the release of these Israeli prisoners, the United States stands with Israel and sends a united message to terrorists that their fanatic behavior will be unsuccessful in deterring a Middle East peace.

I support the efforts the Israeli government has thus far made in attempting to gain the captives' release. Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni and her fellow ministers, as well as Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, have continued to raise this issue at the highest levels in their diplomatic meetings.

These three brave soldiers have been held hostage without medical attention and without communication or access to their family for far too long. The United States Congress has not forgotten these men and will make every effort to secure their freedom. The Shalit, Goldwasser and Regev families should know that I and the United States stand by them and pray for the return of their sons.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 107, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT BANGLADESH SHOULD DROP CHARGES AGAINST SALAH UDDIN SHOAB CHAUDHURY

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the resolution (H. Res. 64) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Bangladesh should immediately drop all pending charges against Bangladeshi journalist Salah Uddin Shoaib Choudhury, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 64

Whereas Salah Uddin Shoaib Choudhury is a Bangladeshi journalist who, because of his beliefs in an interfaith dialogue between Jews and Muslims and criticism of Islamic extremism, is on trial for sedition, an offense punishable by death;

Whereas on November 29, 2003, Mr. Choudhury was arrested at Zia International Airport in Dhaka, Bangladesh, on his way to board a flight bound for Tel Aviv; Mr. Choudhury's passport was seized, along with considerable sums of money and several personal items; on that same day police raided Mr. Choudhury's home and newspaper offices, seizing files, computers, and other valuables;

Whereas Mr. Choudhury was detained in Dhaka Central Jail for a passport violation, then subsequently charged with sedition; Mr. Choudhury suffered harsh interrogation techniques and received no treatment for a debilitating case of glaucoma; Mr. Choudhury's incarceration lasted 17 months without legal recourse;

Whereas on April 30, 2005, after intervention by the United States Department of State and congressional offices, Mr. Choudhury was released on bail;

Whereas in the subsequent months, senior members of the Bangladeshi Government made continuous public promises that there was no substance to Mr. Choudhury's pending charges and that all charges would be dropped;

Whereas on September 29, 2005, Mr. Choudhury was awarded the "Freedom to Write Award" by PEN USA;

Whereas on May 5, 2006, Mr. Choudhury was awarded the American Jewish Committee's Moral Courage Award in absentia in Washington, D.C.; two days prior to Mr. Choudhury receiving the award, after returning Mr. Choudhury's passport and appearing to allow him to attend, senior Bangladeshi Government officials issued threats to prevent him from leaving the country;

Whereas on September 18, 2006, a judge with alleged ties to an Islamic extremist party ruled that Mr. Choudhury will stand trial for sedition; the judge made this ruling despite the Public Prosecutor's testimony in court days before that the government did not have evidence and would not object to the charges being dropped;

Whereas members of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom visited with Mr. Choudhury on their trip to Bangladesh in February and March 2006;

Whereas on October 6, 2006, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom wrote a letter to U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs Richard A. Boucher calling on the United States Government to strengthen the "voices of moderation" in countries like Bangladesh where the rule of law, democratic institutions, and respect for human rights are under assault by violent extremists; the Commission identified Mr. Choudhury as one of those voices that should not be silenced;

Whereas, according to the Department of State's 2005 Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Bangladesh, "Attacks on journalists and newspapers, and government efforts to intimidate them, political party

activists, and others, occurred frequently."; and

Whereas moderate voices in the Muslim world must be supported and protected to advance the security of the United States and its allies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Government of Bangladesh should immediately drop all pending charges against Bangladeshi journalist Salah Uddin Shoaib Choudhury;

(2) the Government of Bangladesh should immediately return all of Mr. Choudhury's confiscated possessions; and

(3) the Government of Bangladesh should cease harassment and intimidation of Mr. Choudhury and take steps to protect Mr. Choudhury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my friend and colleague MARK KIRK from Illinois as well as that of Mrs. LOWEY of New York for their leadership on this important human rights case.

With passage of this resolution, Congress will firmly indicate its view that the government of Bangladesh should immediately release a Bangladeshi journalist whose only apparent crime is to attempt to visit the democratic nation of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, Bangladesh has undergone great political turmoil in recent months, and the nation is now being ruled by a caretaker government. As Bangladesh moves towards a new round of elections, it is imperative that the rule of law and freedom of the press be preserved.

The current government has set out an agenda to reform Bangladesh's political system and to stem corruption. We have seen lately the arrest of many previously high-ranking government officials. It is my sincere wish that the standards of responsible governance survive under the caretaker government until free and fair elections take place, elections that I hope will happen in the near term.

In this time of great political turmoil in Bangladesh, it is truly inexplicable that the government would focus its scarce resources on prosecuting a journalist.

Mr. Choudhury believes in interfaith dialogue between Jews and Muslims as

an alternative to religious extremism, and has been commended by the international community for such bravery of thought.

Gaining the respect and concern of organizations like the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, Mr. Choudhury has shown immense resiliency after facing numerous political and physical threats.

Mr. Choudhury's actions are courageous, not criminal, and it is time for the government of Bangladesh to take decisive action and drop all pending charges. The political leadership of Bangladesh should focus on getting its own house in order instead of mindlessly prosecuting someone for trying to promote international peace and stability.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At the outset, I would like to express my appreciation for the outstanding leadership of Congressman KIRK in introducing this timely resolution. It has my wholehearted support.

Mr. Choudhury is a Bangladeshi journalist and the editor of the Weekly Blitz, the largest tabloid English-language weekly in Bangladesh. He is currently facing a sedition trial for daring to reach out to Jewish and Israeli writers, as well as for speaking openly about the threat radical Islam poses in Bangladesh.

Mr. Choudhury was arrested in November 2003 when he tried to attend a conference in Israel and then was subjected to brutal treatment while in prison. Although he was released last year, in large part due to the efforts of Congressman KIRK and others, the Bangladesh government refuses to drop the charges against Mr. Choudhury, apparently trying to intimidate him into silence.

Last May, the American Jewish Committee presented Mr. Choudhury with the Moral Courage Award recognizing his efforts to promote dialogue between Muslims and Jews and his courage in speaking out against Islamic extremism.

Unfortunately, however, the authorities in Dhaka refused to permit him to visit the U.S. to receive the honor.

Mr. Speaker, Bangladesh and the U.S. have been good friends for over 35 years. Despite many handicaps, Bangladesh has made good progress in some key areas of development, including agricultural production, improved literacy rates, basic social services, and empowering women through employment and education.

As the fourth most populous Muslim country in the world, a moderate and stable Bangladesh can play an important role in regional and world affairs.

Today, however, Bangladesh is at a crossroads. National elections are being postponed amidst electoral chaos; meanwhile, the military appears

to be playing an increasingly large role within the Bangladeshi interim government.

The prospect of holding free and fair elections during the first half of 2007 appears to be much in doubt. More broadly, endemic political polarization, corruption and related governance concerns, as well as the rise of violent extremists remains substantial challenges for the Bangladeshi society.

Mr. Speaker, in this context I urge the authorities in Dhaka to send a strong signal about the importance Bangladesh attaches to tolerance and the rule of law by dropping these politically motivated charges against Mr. Choudhury. I support the resolution and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the author of this resolution.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution which marks this family member and what has happened to him as a prisoner of conscience in Bangladesh.

When we see what happened to him after advocating the cause of religious reconciliation between Muslims and Jews, we see the condition of Salah Choudhury after a severe beating which he was subjected to.

□ 1245

This resolution urges the government of Bangladesh to drop all charges against Bangladeshi journalist Salah Uddin Shoaib Choudhury.

Mr. Choudhury now faces charges of sedition, treason and blasphemy. He faces these charges because of his belief in an interfaith dialogue between Jews and Muslims, and because of articles that he published critical of Islamic extremism. Under Bangladeshi law, sedition is a crime punishable by death.

Mr. Choudhury was detained in November 2003 at Zia International Airport in Dhaka, Bangladesh, on his way to board a flight for Tel Aviv simply to participate in the annual Hebrew Writers Conference. Mr. Choudhury's passport was seized, along with considerable sums of money and several personal items. On that same day, the police raided his home, his newspaper, and seized files, computers and other valuables.

Since Bangladeshi law currently prohibits travel to Israel, Choudhury was first cited for a minor passport violation, but he was subsequently charged with sedition and accused of espionage as an Israeli spy and incarcerated indefinitely. He was subjected to harsh interrogation techniques and received no treatment for a debilitating case of glaucoma.

After being denied due process, Choudhury languished in jail for 17

months until one tireless human rights champion, and my constituent, Dr. Richard Benkin, began a personal odyssey to free Shoaib Choudhury. Dr. Benkin met Mr. Choudhury through a pro-Israel Internet Web site, and Dr. Benkin brought this situation to my attention and now before the House. All together, we sought for his freedom, and shortly thereafter, we did succeed in getting Choudhury's release from jail, finally reuniting him with his wife and two children.

Following Shoaib's release, a senior Bangladesh government official made numerous public pledges that all pending legal action against Mr. Choudhury would be dropped. Nevertheless, the government pressed forward with formal sedition charges.

Mr. Choudhury has won the recognition of international human rights and freedom of expression organizations for his courage. He was honored by PEN U.S.A.'s Freedom to Write Award and was presented with the American Jewish Committee's prestigious Moral Courage Award in absentia in Washington, D.C. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom intervened and wrote a letter to Assistant Secretary of State Richard Boucher calling on the U.S. Government to strengthen the voices of moderation in countries like Bangladesh where the rule of law, democratic institutions, and respect for human rights are under assault by violent extremists. The commission identified Mr. Choudhury as one of those voices.

But despite such international attention, the persecution of Choudhury has persisted. Mr. Choudhury's newspaper offices were bombed by Islamic extremists in July 2006, and he was attacked by a mob in his office on October 5, 2006, where this very picture was taken. A judge with alleged ties to Islamic extremist groups then ruled that Choudhury must stand trial for his life for sedition.

Bangladesh today is at a crossroads. Much-anticipated elections were postponed due to irregularities, and a state of emergency was declared. In a country with 150 million people packed into a land mass smaller than Iowa, 85 percent of whom are Muslim, it is critically important for Bangladesh to demonstrate its commitment to democratic institutions, to religious freedom, and to human rights. For his message of moderation and interfaith dialogue between Muslims and Jews, Mr. Choudhury is facing unjust criminal charges in an effort to silence him. The House of Representatives sends a clear message today that we will not allow an outspoken advocate for religious freedom to be quelled by intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this resolution and would like to thank Chairman LANTOS for his friendship and support in bringing this up and for his tireless advocacy on behalf of human rights of all as co-chairman of the Human Rights Caucus. I

also want to thank Ranking Member LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her support on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I would like also to thank our ambassador to Bangladesh, Patricia Butenis, for her outstanding work at Embassy Dhaka. Her team has been vigorously monitoring this case, attending Mr. Choudhury's legal proceedings, and making strong public statements on his behalf.

I also want to thank Dr. Richard Benkin, sitting in the gallery today, for his unrelenting pursuit of justice on behalf of Shoaib Choudhury. I am proud to join Dr. Benkin in this endeavor and look forward to one day when we may even host Shoaib Choudhury in our very own Mount Prospect, Illinois.

Lastly, I want to thank the best congressional human rights staffer that I have ever had: Jeff Phillips had worked tirelessly on behalf of an African prisoner of conscience for months until he finally won his release. Now he has seized on Shoaib's case and made it a cause in the United States, in Canada, in Europe, and the subcontinent. He, we, have all been inspired by Shoaib and Dr. Benkin, and we hope by this resolution this case and a potential death sentence against Shoaib can be lifted. Shoaib is not a criminal, and he should not become a martyr. He is a model for interfaith tolerance and discussion between all of those of different faiths in the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members of the House are reminded to refrain from bringing to the attention of the House occupants of the galleries.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished Chair of the appropriations subcommittee on Foreign Operations and the cosponsor of this resolution before us.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank my distinguished colleague from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 64, a resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Government of Bangladesh should drop all charges against Bangladeshi journalist, Salah Uddin Shoaib Choudhury. I want to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for his leadership on this issue.

In May of 2006, the American Jewish Committee awarded Mr. Choudhury the Moral Courage Award. Unfortunately, he was not there to receive this honor because more than 2 years earlier he was arrested while attempting to board a flight from Bangladesh to Tel Aviv. Mr. Choudhury's passport was confiscated, his house and possessions were raided, and he was first cited for a passport violation because Bangladeshi law prohibits travel to Israel. Subsequently, he was charged with sedition, accused of espionage, and imprisoned for 17 months.

What is his crime? Mr. Choudhury spoke up for interfaith dialogue, he published articles critical of Islamic extremism, and he appealed for greater religious tolerance and freedom. For these "crimes" he is charged with sedition, an offense punishable by death.

Mr. Choudhury has already been harassed and subjected to harsh interrogation techniques in prison. His newspaper offices were bombed by Islamic extremists in July of 2006, and he was physically attacked in October of 2006.

This resolution calls on the Government of Bangladesh to immediately drop the charges against Mr. Choudhury, to return his confiscated property, to stop intimidation tactics against him, and to protect him from future harassment.

Mr. Choudhury advocates peace and tolerance. It is time that Congress sends a strong and clear message: we are watching, and we will not allow Mr. Choudhury and others like him to be silenced.

I hope you will join me in strongly supporting H. Res. 64.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding; and, Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and Mrs. NITA LOWEY for their hard work in bringing this thoughtful resolution to the House floor today.

I was in Bangladesh about 3 weeks ago where I had the opportunity to meet with the new caretaker government, that leadership, as well as the leaderships in the two main political parties that are vying for power and have held power the last several decades. In fact, I met with our ambassador and members in the business community.

But one of the highlights and I think the most significant thing that I had an opportunity to do was to meet with the gentleman, Shoaib Choudhury, who is a journalist, and we have heard much talk about his situation this morning. But I think the gravity of it is significant, and I think it is important that this House is taking this action today.

Mr. Choudhury is a journalist in Bangladesh, known for his viewpoints which are favorable to expanding dialogue between Muslims and Jews and Christians and for developing ties with Israel. As was indicated, he was actually arrested on his way to Israel at the airport, and he is also trying to have more equality relative to religion and especially his observance and opposition to Islamic extremism, which unfortunately is on the rise in Bangladesh and in a number of regions.

Just as Islamic extremism and fundamentalism have been a danger in other areas of the world, it is a real problem in Bangladesh, and he has had the courage to speak out on this important issue.

Unfortunately, in a place where journalists are not necessarily given broad

freedom of speech as our media would have here in this country, Mr. Choudhury was arrested and charged with sedition and accused of espionage and unjustly incarcerated for 17 months during which he received less than adequate treatment for glaucoma and other conditions from which he suffers. He is now facing charges which could bring the death penalty under Bangladesh law.

Now, several government leaders indicated that they do not intend to pursue the death penalty in this particular case; but when one considers the actions for which Mr. Choudhury was charged, this is not a person that should be jailed in the first place. This is a person who should be honored, as he has been around the world. You have to admire his strength and his resilience.

I asked him how he was being treated and spoke with him about the prospects for his trial. His next trial appearance was supposed to be February 28. At the time of my visit, Mr. Choudhury was encouraged by recent government assurances that his charges might be dropped or that they did not intend to go forward with the death penalty; but as it turns out, a radical Islamist-affiliated judge recently signed an order forcing the trial and the court proceedings to proceed. He is being accused of a threat to the security of Bangladesh. So much for a fair trial and just treatment.

This is something that really should get the attention not only of this House but the world.

This bipartisan resolution on the floor today urges the Bangladeshi Government to drop all charges against Mr. Choudhury. The United States Congress should show Mr. Choudhury that he can count on our full support and that the success of fledgling democracies such as Bangladesh lies squarely on the very freedoms that Mr. Choudhury embodies.

I am glad to be a cosponsor of this important resolution. I thank the Speaker for recognizing this and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, again in closing, I want to thank the chairman of the Middle East Subcommittee, Mr. ACKERMAN, for bringing this forward. Certainly we want to thank Mr. KIRK for his hard work and then Mrs. LOWEY for making this a very bipartisan effort, and I would urge all of my colleagues to support this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my gratitude to Mr. BOOZMAN, the gentleman from Arkansas, for his expeditious handling of this on the floor. I want to thank both Mr. KIRK and Mrs. LOWEY for bringing this resolution to our attention and to also note the great spirit of nonpartisanship

that we have on this matter and hope that that could splash over and spill over and overwhelm some prevailing attitudes on both sides so that we might bring this kind of approach and dedication to all of the legislation that we have before us this session.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 64, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING THE 186TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 228) recognizing the 186th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 228

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy;

Whereas Greek Commander in Chief Petros Mavromichalis, a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821 that "it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you";

Whereas Greece played a major role in the World War II struggle to protect freedom and democracy through such bravery as was shown in the historic Battle of Crete, which provided the Axis land war with its first major setback, setting off a chain of events that significantly affected the outcome of World War II;

Whereas the price for Greece in holding our common values in their region was high, as hundreds of thousands of civilians were killed in Greece during World War II;

Whereas throughout the 20th century, Greece was one of only three countries in the world, other than the former British Empire, that allied with the United States in every major international conflict;

Whereas President George W. Bush, in recognizing Greek Independence Day, said, "Greece and America have been firm allies in the great struggles for liberty. Americans will always remember Greek heroism and Greek sacrifice for the sake of freedom . . . [and] as the 21st Century dawns, Greece and America once again stand united; this time

in the fight against terrorism. The United States deeply appreciates the role Greece is playing in the war against terror. . . . America and Greece are strong allies, and we're strategic partners.”;

Whereas President Bush stated that Greece's successful “law enforcement operations against a terrorist organization [November 17] responsible for three decades of terrorist attacks underscore the important contributions Greece is making to the global war on terrorism”;

Whereas Greece is a strategic partner and ally of the United States in bringing political stability and economic development to the volatile Balkan region, having invested over \$10 billion in the region;

Whereas Greece was extraordinarily responsive to requests by the United States during the war in Iraq, as Greece immediately granted unlimited access to its airspace and the base in Souda Bay, and many ships of the United States that delivered troops, cargo, and supplies to Iraq were refueled in Greece;

Whereas in August 2004, the Olympic games came home to Athens, Greece, the land of their ancient birthplace 2,500 years ago and the city of their modern revival in 1896;

Whereas Greece received world-wide praise for its extraordinary handling during the 2004 Olympics of over 14,000 athletes from 202 countries and over 2 million spectators and journalists, which it did so efficiently, securely, and with its famous Greek hospitality;

Whereas the unprecedented security effort in Greece for the first summer Olympics after the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, included a record-setting expenditure of over \$1,390,000,000 and assignment of over 70,000 security personnel, as well as the utilization of an eight-country Olympic Security Advisory Group that included the United States;

Whereas Greece, located in a region where Christianity meets Islam and Judaism, maintains excellent relations with Muslim nations and Israel;

Whereas the Government of Greece has had extraordinary success in recent years in furthering cross-cultural understanding and reducing tensions between Greece and Turkey;

Whereas Greece and the United States are at the forefront of the effort for freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those and other ideals have forged a close bond between Greece and the United States and their peoples;

Whereas March 25, 2007, the National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy, marks the 186th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire and celebrates the aspirations for democracy that the peoples of Greece and the United States share; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate this anniversary with the Greek people and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which these two great nations were born: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 186th anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed; and

(3) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 186 years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to pay tribute on Greek Independence Day to one of America's most important European allies, Greece, and one that holds immeasurable importance to millions of Americans.

I would also like to thank my good friend from Florida (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN), who has been a leading supporter of U.S.-Greek relations in Congress.

Western civilization as we know it today is undeniably connected to Greece. For every American, Greece is known as the cradle of democracy. As a nation that still seeks to perfect its democracy in civic society, America looks to Greece and its universally known philosophers and leaders for political inspiration and wisdom. In fact, the very word “democracy” is a Greek word. The history of Greek independence is inspiring, especially given America's own history and drive for independence from tyranny and oppression. Greeks have been willing to fight for independence, sacrifice for the sake of freedom, and have stirred others to do the same.

As a Member of Congress with a large Greek-American community, I am especially pleased that we are passing this resolution today, which also highlights the extraordinary contributions of a community that has contributed greatly to the shared prosperity of our Nation. Today, the Greek-American community remains the bedrock in the unbreakable bond between the United States and our ally, Greece. As ambassadors of goodwill between the United States and Greece, Greek Americans have for decades shaped this long-standing friendship, creating a partnership based on freedom, democracy and peace.

Today, some 5 million Americans claim Greek ancestry, with understandable pride. Greece is one of less than a handful of nations that have stood shoulder-to-shoulder with the United States in every major war of the 20th century. Our close relations became even closer after World War II. The Truman Doctrine helped save Greece from communism, indeed helped save it for the Western world, and the Marshall Plan helped pave the way for economic success.

In 1952, Greece joined NATO, formalizing the deep mutual commitment of Greece and the rest of the western world to protecting freedom. Now, as an integral member of the EU for two decades, Greece has become increasingly prosperous, a democratic role model for the nations of the world.

Greece remains a critical strategic partner in today's post-Cold War world. We cooperate closely in promoting

peace and stability in the Balkans. Athens has supported efforts to settle the Cyprus problem and to end the divide on the island. And I am especially supportive of Greece's critical efforts in recent years to resolve historic differences with its neighbor, Turkey, including supporting that country's membership in the EU.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Greek people on the 186th anniversary of their independence and strongly support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 228, recognizing the 186th anniversary of the independence of Greece, celebrating Greek and American democracy and recognizing Greece as a very staunch ally and friend of our United States.

Greece was the birthplace of the principles of democracy on which our Nation was founded. Our Founders studied Greek culture and Greek politics, and their influence is still with us today. Over the centuries, Greece has demonstrated its commitment to what it and our Nation prize among our highest ideals, and that word is “liberty,” “eleftheria” to the Greek people.

Indeed, many of our Nation's respective ideas are shared and, therefore, our relationship holds a special significance. Both the United States and Greece share much in common. Both are outward-looking trading nations that have enriched the world through commercial and cultural exchanges.

Over the decades the U.S.-Greek relationship has developed quite dynamically, bolstered by common ideas and cooperation. Moreover, the Greek people have strived to protect freedom and democracy, allying itself with the United States in every major conflict of the 20th century, notably sacrificing for and contributing to the victory of the Allied forces over the Axis powers during World War II.

Today, our common destinies are threatened by other enemies who scorn our commitment to freedom, eleftheria, and aggression from Islamic extremism looms large and threatens western civilization that was born in that country of Greece. We are grateful that the Greek people have stood against this aggression throughout the years.

Indeed, Greece should be praised for its contributions in the global war on terror. In the war in Iraq, Greece has been responsive to U.S. requests for access to its air space and in fueling U.S. ships that supply cargo ships headed to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to further cooperation between our two nations and expanding the friendship that exists between Greek and American people. I therefore ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the nation of Greece on the 186th anniversary of its independence and to express their

acknowledgment of the great friendship that exists between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, 5½ minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished chairman and I thank my colleagues, my fellow member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. LANTOS, and the ranking member, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Certainly, I have indicated already to Chairman WEXLER thanks for his continued leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, of course, to acknowledge and certainly support recognizing the 186th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy. Greece has been a long-term model, if you will, for the principles of democracy. Any of us who have had the honor of learning the Greek philosophers throughout our academic training know that the principles they have enunciated have been strong and lasting.

With that in mind as I celebrate the 186th anniversary, I commend my friends in Greece for their continued deliberations dealing with the issue of divide between the Turks and Greece, and I look forward to an opportunity that resolutions will come about that would solve some of those problems.

Might I, Mr. WEXLER, also indicate my support for H. Res. 64, which speaks to the freedom of press and particularly expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the government of Bangladesh should immediately drop all charges against Bangladeshi journalist Salah Uddin Shoaib Choudhury. I say that in recognition of the principles of freedom of press. Whenever we have had the opportunity to interact in bilaterals through Members of Congress or parliamentarians, one of the key issues that are discussed is the right of the voice of the opposition, or the voice of difference to be expressed. I hope that this particular legislation will pass with a firm statement by this Congress that we are, if you will, asking for his release.

Might I also support H. Res. 107. I am an original cosponsor of this legislation calling for the immediate and unconditional release of the Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah. Let me say this, I have met with one of the family members of one of the captive soldiers.

I think what is important in this statement, because we know that King Abdullah just a few days ago came to this Congress and said, we can make a difference in the Palestinian-Israeli issue. This happens to be soldiers that are in Lebanon, and, frankly, I think the point should be made that Israel has, in fact, done what they said they would do in pulling back.

Whenever you get agreements that are kept, promises that are kept, then it seems that in the course of international collegiality or international decorum or international protocol that you have the opportunity to receive your soldiers back home, your loved ones back home. These young men, who are still being held, Gilad Shalit, Eldad Regev and Ehud Goldwasser, remain in captivity, even though the United Nations has, through passing United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701, imposed a ceasefire on the Lebanon-Israel border. The resolution called for, and I quote, the unconditional release of the abducted Israeli soldiers. Even in the United Nations, which has a place for disparate voices and has a place for disagreement, we find that there is a call for their release.

So I would hope that this particular legislation is not taken as a negative, but it is taken in compliance with the United Nations' interests in countries, recognizing when agreements are made that we can move forward on the agreement, and the captivity of soldiers of another sovereign nation certainly argues against having a world forum that really works.

The United Nations has managed with all its difficulties to be a world forum. It has made a statement that they should be released. I would hope there would be enough resolve in Hezbollah and certainly in Hamas and others and in Lebanon, that whatever your viewpoint, you certainly should have the view to provide comfort to these families and have their loved ones returned.

So I ask again for support of the underlying bill; that is, H. Res. 228, and I add my support for H. Res. 64; and as a cosponsor of H. Res. 107, I add my support for that.

I conclude by simply saying that we have an opportunity to accept the challenge of King Abdullah in the way that we must know how to do it, and that is engagement and resolve for the best of all people in the Mideast. I hope that we will do so, and I would say to my friends in Lebanon, a good step and a good start would be the release, unconditional release of these soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 107, which calls for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldiers held captive by Hamas and Hezbollah and expresses the Congress's support for a two-state resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Mr. Speaker, while the fighting between Israel and Hamas and Hezbollah has subsided, one of the initial causes for the war, has not yet been addressed. Three young men, Gilad Shalit, Eldad Regev, and Ehud Goldwasser, remain in captivity.

The fighting last summer ended when the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1701, which imposed a ceasefire on the Israel-Lebanon border. That resolution unequivocally called for "the unconditional release of the abducted Israeli soldiers."

Therefore, their ongoing captivity is ignoring the will of the international community. Indeed,

Hamas and Hezbollah have not even allowed access to the Israeli captives by competent medical personnel and representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 107 expresses this Congress's vision for "a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through the creation of a viable and independent Palestinian state living in peace alongside of the State of Israel." But this vision cannot be achieved by continuing to hold these soldiers by Hamas and Hezbollah.

The United States cannot turn a blind eye when citizens of a fellow democracy fall prey to terrorists acts. Israeli soldiers must be released without delay and without preconditions, as the Security Council demands. That is also our demand. We will remain committed to the soldiers' freedom—for the sake of peace and to move toward a just resolution to these conflicts in the Mid East.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution sponsored by Mr. ACKERMAN, the chairman of the Middle East and South Asia Subcommittee. I urge all my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep pride and respect to the Hellenic Republic as it prepares to celebrate the anniversary of Greek Independence Day, which took place on March 25, 1821.

I am almost certain that Thomas Jefferson cast an eye across the Atlantic towards Greece when he uttered these words in 1821, "The flames kindled on the 4th of July, 1776, have not spread over much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism . . . On the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them."

It is God's handiwork that I am blessed to straddle two cultures that have been beacons of liberty for all of civilization. The place of my birth, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the United States of America, and the land of my ancestors, the birthplace of democracy, the Hellenic Republic, Greece. I honor those brave and resilient Greeks who refused to be assimilated or converted into the Ottoman Empire. They endured centuries of torture and persecution to hang on to their precious heritage and faith. Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the emblem of freedom for Hellenes, the flag bearing a white cross and nine blue and white stripes representing the nine letters, *eleftheria*, freedom.

This was an act of defiance against the Ottoman Empire, marking the beginning of Greece's war of independence on March 25, 1821.

□ 1315

Cries of Zito I Ellas, long live Greece; *Eleftheria* I Thanatos, live free or die, could be heard from the Ionian to the Aegean, from the Peloponnese to the Dodocanese where my grandparents are from.

It took 8 hard-fought years, until 1829, for the Sultan Mahmud to capitulate and surrender. Greek independence

was guaranteed with the Treaty of Adrianople.

Greeks were the first Ottoman subjects to secure recognition as an independent and sovereign nation. It was a fierce fight that drew support from Philhellenes the world over. None other than the United States, England, Lord Byron was wonderful in this cause.

Undoubtedly, these Philhellenes were indebted to Greece, the world's first advanced civilization, for providing a cultural heritage that has influenced the world with firsts in philosophy, politics, mathematics, science, art and sport with the Olympics, just to name a few.

I honor my ancestors for their deep abiding conviction in all that is good and true about mankind. I celebrate their bravery and commitment to freedom and justice. I praise their perseverance and patience in the face of unspeakable hardships. I commend their sacrifices to posterity so that, should there ever be another who seeks to oppress freedom-loving people, we will be able to look upon history and summon up the same courage that those unyielding Hellenes exhibited nearly two centuries ago.

Just as our great Founding Fathers studied the model of democracy the ancient Greeks put forth, it is likely our revolution for independence in the late 18th century served as a blueprint for the early 19th-century Greeks to try their hand at freedom and sovereignty. It is a beautiful, symbolic symbiotic relationship that the United States and Greece have shared since, and it continues to enjoy.

As George Washington proclaimed at the onset of the American Revolution: "Our cause is noble. It is the cause of mankind." So it was in 1776 America and in 1821 Greece, and so it will always remain.

Zito I Ellas, and God bless America.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who also is the cochair of the Hellenic Caucus.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this legislation, H. Res. 228, and co-chair and cofounder of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I rise today to celebrate the 186th anniversary of Greece's independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Against incredibly difficult odds, the Greeks defeated one of the most powerful empires in history to gain their independence.

Following 400 years of Ottoman rule, in March 1821, Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the traditional Greek flag at the monastery of Agia Lavras, inciting his countrymen to rise up against the Ottoman Empire.

The bishop timed this act of revolution to coincide with the Greek Orthodox holiday celebrating the archangel Gabriel's announcement that the Virgin Mary was pregnant with the divine child.

Bishop Germanos' message to his people was clear, a new spirit was about to be born in Greece. The following year, the Treaty of Constantinople established full independence of Greece.

As we celebrate Greek Independence Day, we should reflect upon the strong ties between Greece and the United States and the strong commitment to democracy shared by our two countries.

The Greeks of 1821 fought for independence from the Ottoman Empire while drawing inspiration from the ideals and institutions of the United States.

During their war of independence, the Greeks also received support from many Americans, including Presidents James Madison and James Monroe and Representatives Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, each of whom gave speeches and made resolutions and other statements in Congress in support of the Greek revolutionaries.

Just as our defeat of the British Army was remarkable, so too was the Greek triumph over the Ottoman Army, a momentous achievement in world history.

New York City is home to the largest Hellenic population outside of Greece and Cyprus. Western Queens, which I have the honor of representing, is often called Little Athens because of the large Hellenic population in its neighborhoods.

New Yorkers celebrate Greek Independence Day with a parade on Fifth Avenue, along with many cultural events, private meetings and celebrations. These events, hosted by the Federation of Hellenic Societies and other Hellenic and Philhellenic organizations and friends, remind us of the Hellenic American community's many, many contributions to our Nation's history and culture.

Relations between the United States and Greece remain strong with a shared commitment to ensuring stability in southeastern Europe.

I hope permanent solutions can be found for ending the division of Cyprus and finding a mutually agreed upon name for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Additionally, I strongly support the inclusion of Greece in the Visa Waiver Program. Last month, along with Representatives SPACE and BILIRAKIS and 18 of our House colleagues, we sent letters to Secretary Rice and Secretary Chertoff urging them to extend the Visa Waiver Program to Greece. Greece is the only member of the original 15 European Union nations not to belong to the Visa Waiver Program.

Greece has met the criteria for the program, including a less than 3 percent refusal rate of U.S. nonimmigrant visa applicants and biometric passports. I hope that they will soon be included in the program, and I ask my colleagues and the Nation to join me in celebrating Greek's independence today.

Additionally, it is my sincere pleasure to pay tribute to the New York Hellenic American community for its many, many contributions to our city and Nation.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Affairs, I am proud to congratulate the nation of Greece on the 186th anniversary of independence. Though it began the cradle of Democracy and formed the foundation of Western thought, Greece was ruled over by various empires until 1821 when the people of Greece threw off Ottoman oppression and set about founding a government that would be ruled by Greeks and for Greeks.

The ancient Greek city-states provided young American with a strong foundation of government and philosophy to build our democracies. In both our nations, the Golden Age of Greece continues to be a guiding light.

During the last 50 years, the United States has been proud to stand with the Greek people as they confronted communist oppression, solidified their democracy, and became part of the vibrant European economy.

Independence, once achieved, is not guaranteed for all time. We know that at all times there must be those who are willing to sacrifice to retain liberty. Both of our nations have faced struggles for survival since the initial moment of independence. We must continue to support each other in the causes of freedom and democracy.

Again, I congratulate the Greek people on this historic day. It is a day to remember the sacrifices of the past, to take pride in your nation, and to look forward to a bright future.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WEXLER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, and also Ranking Member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for their work on this legislation.

We have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I too want to thank Mr. POE. And we also do not have any more speakers, so we will yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 228.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF ROME

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 230) recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome signed on March 25, 1957, which was a key step in creating the European Union, and reaffirming the close

and mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and Europe.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 230

Whereas, after a half century marked by two world wars and at a time when Europe was divided and some nations were deprived of freedom, and as the continent faced the urgent need for economic and political recovery, major European statesmen such as Robert Schuman, Jean Monnet, Paul-Henri Spaak, Konrad Adenauer, Alcide de Gasperi, Sir Winston Churchill, and others joined together to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among their peoples;

Whereas on March 25, 1957, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg signed the Treaty of Rome to establish a customs union, to create a framework to promote the free movement of people, services, and capital among the member states, to support agricultural growth, and to create a common transport policy, which gave new impetus to the pledge of unity in the European Coal and Steel Agreement of 1951;

Whereas to fulfill its purpose, the European Union has created a unique set of institutions: the directly-elected European Parliament, the Council consisting of representatives of the Member States, the Commission acting in the general interest of the Community, and the Court of Justice to enforce the rule of law;

Whereas on February 7, 1992, the leaders of the then 12 members of the European Community signed the Treaty of Maastricht establishing a common European currency, the Euro, to be overseen by a common financial institution, the European Central Bank, for the purpose of a freer movement of capital and common European economic policies;

Whereas the European Union was expanded with the addition of the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Ireland in 1973, Greece in 1981, Spain and Portugal in 1986, a unified Germany in 1990, Austria, Finland, and Sweden in 1995, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia in 2004, and Bulgaria and Romania in 2007, making the European Union a body of 27 countries with a population of over 450 million people;

Whereas the European Union has developed policies in the economic, security, diplomatic, and political areas: it has established a single market with broad common policies to organize that market and ensure prosperity and cohesion; it has built an economic and monetary union, including the Euro currency; and it has built an area of freedom, security, and justice, extending stability to its neighbors;

Whereas following the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the European Union has played a critical role in the former Central European communist states in promoting free markets, democratic institutions and values, respect for human rights, and the resolve to fight against tyranny and for common national security objectives;

Whereas for the past 50 years the United States and the European Union have shared a unique partnership, mindful of their common heritage, shared values and mutual interests, have worked together to strengthen transatlantic security, to preserve and promote peace and freedom, to develop free and prosperous economies, and to advance human rights; and

Whereas the United States has supported the European integration process and has consistently supported the objective of European unity and the enlargement of the European Union as desirable developments which promote prosperity, peace, and democracy,

and which contribute to the strengthening of the vital relationship between the United States and the nations of Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historic significance of the Treaty of Rome on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of its signing;

(2) commends the European Union and the member nations of the European Union for the positive role which the institution has played in the growth, development, and prosperity of contemporary Europe;

(3) recognizes the important role played by the European Union in fostering the independence, democracy, and economic development of the former Central European communist states following the end of the Cold War;

(4) acknowledges the vital role of the European Union in the development of the close and mutually beneficial relationship that exists between the United States and Europe;

(5) affirms that in order to strengthen the transatlantic partnership there must be a renewed commitment to regular and intensive consultations between the United States and the European Union; and

(6) joins with the European Parliament in agreeing to strengthen the transatlantic partnership by enhancing the dialogue and collaboration between the United States Congress and the European Parliament.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 230, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I first want to thank Chairman LANTOS for introducing this resolution with me. If there is anyone in Congress who fully understands the significance of this moment, it is Congressman LANTOS, who has been an unwavering supporter of the transatlantic alliance and the creation of the European Union.

In addition, I want to thank the ranking member of the Europe Subcommittee, Mr. GALLEGLY, for his efforts in bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1957, in an attempt to recover from destruction caused by two devastating world wars, six European nations, France, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Luxembourg, joined together in common interest to form the foundations of a new economic and political community. The resulting Treaty of Rome laid the framework to promote an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe.

At that time, the Treaty of Rome provided for the establishment of a common market, a customs union and common policies, expanding on the unity already established in the European Coal and Steel Community. The founding members, keen on ensuring the past was not to be repeated, were particularly interested in the idea of creating a community of peace and stability through economic ties.

The success of the European Economic Community inspired other countries to apply for membership, making it the first concrete step toward the creation of the European Union. The Treaty of Rome established the basic institutions and decision-making mechanisms still in place today. The European Union, now comprised of 27 countries and over 450 million people, is a unique and a historic example of nation-states transcending their former divisions, deciding to come together for the sake of freedom, peace and prosperity, and resolving their differences in the interest of the common good and rule of law.

The success of the EU over the past 50 years has also benefited greatly the United States. Today, the United States and Europe enjoy a mutually beneficial relationship that has a long and established history.

As the world's most important alliance, the U.S. and the EU are intimately intertwined, cooperating on regional conflicts, collaborating to address global challenges, and sharing strong trade and investment relations.

It is clear that the strongest possible relationship between the United States and Europe is a prerequisite for addressing the challenges of the 21st century. The U.S. and EU are working closely to promote reform and peace in the Middle East, rebuild and enhance security in Afghanistan, support the goals of democratization and prosperity in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Balkans and Central Asia, prevent genocide in Darfur and end the violence and terrorism in Lebanon.

The anniversary of the Rome Treaty is a reminder of the importance of the transatlantic alliance in an increasingly difficult global environment. However, the 50-year EU experiment is an example of the enduring possibilities of democratic transformation and a brighter future for millions.

It is my hope that the EU will continue to keep its doors open and remain a beacon of hope to the citizens of Europe who aspire to obtain the peace and prosperity that have blossomed over the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, and strongly urge the passage of H. Res. 230.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

When Americans visit Europe today, it is hard to see how very damaged the

countries of that continent were when they emerged from the destruction of the Second World War. American assistance played a very important role in rebuilding Western Europe in the 1940s and the 1950s, and American arms played a crucial role in protecting the democracies of Europe from the advance of Soviet communism during the Cold War.

Ultimately, however, Europeans needed to do more on their own to build upon a foundation that the United States had first provided. The 1957 Treaty of Rome, signed by France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands, and Luxembourg was one of the first steps that Western Europe took to put the causes and the legacy of the Second World War behind them.

The treaty established a free-trade region known as the European Economic Community, the cornerstone of what we today know as the European Union.

□ 1330

A post-World War II economically ravaged Europe reasoned that if nations are linked economically, in this case by recalling the role that economic decline and hindered trade among nations had played in the years leading up to World War II, the creators of that free trade zone saw that the freedom of movement of goods, services, capital, and people might well prove to be a great deterrent to conflict between the states of Europe, large and small.

Over the subsequent decades through the entry of new members and expansions both geographically across Europe and functionally across issues, the European Community grew beyond the original core membership of the 1950s and assumed responsibilities going well beyond trade. Today, the European Union indeed counts among its member states countries that once were under Soviet domination. It has worked to transfer more powers from its individual member states to the overall organization centered on the road to creating a more unified European foreign and security policy and making the European Union an organization that the United States increasingly looks to for leadership on transatlantic issues, joining the NATO alliances that continue to bind us together in that common cause.

While the European Community continues to provide a framework within which to conduct international trade, such as multilateral trade negotiations with the United States, it has also advanced the cause of liberty, free markets, democratic institutions, and respect for human rights throughout the European continent. The Treaty of Rome was an important step in building on the foundation that the United States helped create after World War II for Europe.

Today, we look to a strong Europe as seen in the expanded NATO and expanded and strengthened European

Union as a foundation on which we can work together to address new and ever growing challenges. Therefore, with enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, it is that this House should commemorate the 50th anniversary of the signing of this Treaty of Rome.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in supporting H. Res. 230, a resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, which was signed on March 25, 1957. The Treaty of Rome established a customs union—formally known as the European Economic Community—among six countries: Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the Federal Republic of Germany. Today, that customs union is known as the European Union, and now includes 27 countries spanning the length and breadth of Europe. Most importantly, it has grown into an institution that inspires countries to be their better selves.

If one travels to Europe today, it may be hard to remember that, 50 years ago, the continent was still recovering from the second of the two world wars it had unleashed in less than half a century. It may be hard today to recall or imagine the magnitude of devastation that still scarred farmland and cities alike. It may be difficult to conceive of the bitterness, anger and thirst for revenge that bled across the continent like the blood of those fallen in war. The fact that Germany, a country that had unleashed a war of aggression against its neighbors just a few years before, was included in this new “community” was really nothing short of a minor miracle.

Moreover, fifty years ago, Europe was still riven in two—no longer by a shooting war, but by a cold war. While a small group of nations was beginning the slow process of rebuilding their own countries and forging transnational relations based on cooperation, mutual trust, and mutual benefit, another part of the continent had fallen under the boot of communist dictatorship, where the Soviet Union exploited its neighbors, stripping them of wealth, prosperity, and opportunity for generations. Just one year before the Treaty of Rome was signed, the Soviet Union underscored its opposition to any independent foreign or economic policy on the part of East European countries—a message unequivocally sent by its invasion of Hungary.

As the years passed, and the success of the European Economic Communities became ever more apparent, it is no surprise that more countries joined this union. Membership in Council of Europe, the European Union's sister organization and home of the European Court of Human Rights, helped pave the way for membership in the EU. Meanwhile, the NATO alliance created a zone of military security where the post-war citizens of Western Europe could build a zone of financial security.

Since the fall of communism, there is no doubt that the aspiration of joining the European Union, much like the goal of joining the NATO alliance, has helped focus the attention of many countries on overcoming their past differences for a larger, common good that also brings substantial benefits to their own citizens. Today, I commemorate the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, and the new vision it held for the European continent, one that has helped spread peace and prosperity to nearly 500 million people.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 230.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE FOR THE GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 222) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the Good Friday Agreement, signed on April 10, 1998, as a blueprint for a lasting peace in Northern Ireland, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 222

Whereas the Good Friday Agreement, signed on April 10, 1998, sets out a plan for the creation of the Northern Ireland Assembly, and a devolved government in Northern Ireland on a stable and inclusive basis;

Whereas the Northern Ireland Assembly and Executive have been suspended since 2002;

Whereas the St. Andrews Agreement of October 2006 established a timetable for the restoration of a power-sharing government in Northern Ireland;

Whereas the St. Andrews Agreement required that “support for policing and the rule of law should be extended to every part of the community”;

Whereas on January 28, 2007, Sinn Féin held a party conference during which it declared its support for the Police Service of Northern Ireland and the criminal justice system, consistent with the terms of the St. Andrews Agreement;

Whereas British Prime Minister Tony Blair and Irish Taoiseach Bertie Ahern stated on January 30, 2007, that “We remain fixed in our determination to see shared government returned to the people of Northern Ireland.”;

Whereas British Prime Minister Tony Blair called for elections in Northern Ireland to take place on March 7, 2007, in adherence to the timeline established in the St. Andrews Agreement; and

Whereas the St. Andrews Agreement set a deadline of March 26, 2007, for devolved government to be restored to Northern Ireland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) reiterates its support for the Good Friday Agreement, signed on April 10, 1998, in Belfast, as a blueprint for a lasting peace in Northern Ireland;

(B) declares its support for the St. Andrews Agreement of October 2006;

(C) commends British Prime Minister Tony Blair and Irish Taoiseach Bertie Ahern for their leadership and persistence in seeking a peaceful resolution in Northern Ireland; and

(D) commends all parties for abiding by the terms agreed to in the St. Andrews Agreement; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that all political parties in Northern Ireland should—

(A) agree to share power with all parties according to the democratic mandate of the Good Friday Agreement;

(B) meet all deadlines established by the St. Andrews Agreement; and

(C) commit to work in good faith with all the institutions of the Good Friday Agreement, which established the Northern Ireland Assembly and an inclusive Executive, the North-South Ministerial Council, and the British-Irish Inter-Governmental Conference, for the benefit of all the people of Northern Ireland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration, as well as H. Res. 228.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman CAROLYN MCCARTHY of New York, who has been a passionate and tireless advocate for peace and justice in Northern Ireland throughout her distinguished career in Congress.

Over the past several years, the peace process in Northern Ireland has taken many twists and turns. The Good Friday Agreement, designed to bring an end to the conflict in Northern Ireland, has been declared dead time and again. The Northern Ireland Assembly and the Executive established by the Good Friday Agreement have been suspended since 2002.

During the past few months, however, we have witnessed incredibly promising developments in our efforts to fully implement the Good Friday Agreement, which was signed almost 9 years ago on April 10, 1998.

The St. Andrews Agreement of October 2006 established a firm timetable for the restoration of the government in Northern Ireland. In the agreement itself and in subsequent declarations, both sides of the conflict committed themselves to the rule of law, effective policing, and a strong criminal justice system. Most importantly, the elections called for by the St. Andrews Agreement were carried out successfully just last week.

Now the hard work begins, Mr. Speaker. Over the next 2 weeks, Northern Ireland's political parties must agree to share power according to the democratic mandate of the Good Friday Agreement. A failure to reach a power sharing deal will lead to the dissolution of the Northern Ireland As-

sembly, a development which would be profoundly damaging to the long-term prospects for peace in Northern Ireland. With passage of this resolution, Congress urges Northern Ireland's political leaders to make the tough compromises necessary to bring about a power sharing arrangement. With such a deal, the great promise of the Good Friday Agreement and the St. Andrews Agreement can come to fruition.

The resolution before the House is designed to support the forward movement towards peace and to help pave the way to a time when the conflict in Northern Ireland is only a subject for the history books.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this timely resolution, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since 1969, over 3,200 people have died as a result of political violence in Northern Ireland. The 1998 Good Friday Agreement lessened the violence in Northern Ireland considerably, making it a safer place to live and allowing its beleaguered economy to prosper.

While these developments are positive steps forward, political differences between the opposing sides of this conflict led to a stalemate, which in 2002 persuaded the Blair government to suspend the Belfast Northern Ireland Assembly and shift power to direct rule from London. Events have now presented an opportunity to move forward.

Last week, a new Northern Ireland Assembly was elected, and at the end of this month, if an administration is formed, rule from Westminster will cease, with Northern Ireland assuming the reins of power for its own self-government.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair, in expressing his fondest hopes for the success of the Good Friday accords, has stated, "Enemies would become not just partners in progress but sit together in government, and paramilitaries who used to murder each other as a matter of routine would talk to each other and learn to live with each other."

Mr. Speaker, these are noble and lofty goals. While no one thought that they would be easy to achieve and many challenges have arisen, combat is now taking place in the political sphere rather than through violent means. Inch by inch, day by day, with focused determination, success is finally emerging.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a significant voice in the global community that must be raised in support of the progress that has already been achieved, and in calling for further efforts to achieve the goals of the Good Friday Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), who is the sponsor of this resolution.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Subcommittee Chairman WEXLER and Ranking Member POE.

As the author of H.R. 222, I rise in support, as all of the members of the Friends of Ireland Caucus do.

This month, the peace process of Northern Ireland has an opportunity to make great strides. Several significant events are taking place this month. On March 7, new assembly elections were held. On March 14, new members for a power-sharing executive will be nominated. And, finally, on March 26, London will rescind direct rule and restore Northern Ireland's devolved government.

It has been a long road to get to this point, but restored progress has been made. Recently, Democratic Unionist Party leader Mr. Paisley, and Sinn Féin's Gerry Adams spoke directly across the floor on the Northern Ireland Assembly. Some people will say this was a small matter. For those of us that have been involved in this issue, it was a great stand.

This dialogue is a major achievement in the ongoing peace process. However, there is still much work to be done, and this month is critical to ensure a successful devolution on March 26.

President Bush's Special Envoy on Northern Ireland has recognized the importance of this month's events and the need for Congress to help galvanize the momentum to achieve the March 26 deadline.

Former U.S. Senator George Mitchell believes a power sharing deal in Northern Ireland is now possible, following the March 7 assembly elections, but believes the U.S. still has a huge role to play in stimulating the investment and the trade in Northern Ireland.

With that in mind, I have introduced the Good Friday Agreement. This resolution shows Congress' support for the Good Friday Agreement, commends the efforts of Prime Minister Blair and Irish Taoiseach Ahern and all the parties for abiding by the St. Andrews Agreement. H. Res. 222 further encourages the parties to work in good faith to meet the Good Friday Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to make a difference in Ireland by helping to make sure that we keep this momentum going. But I think, more important, when we see the troubles throughout the world today, Ireland has always been something that many of us here in Congress have been fighting for to bring both sides together. The people of Ireland want this peace process to go through. It is good for the whole nation. We here in Congress will be going as an envoy to Ireland during the Easter break, hopefully to be congratulating everybody and telling them we will do whatever we can to make sure the government stays up and running. But, more importantly, it is the people of Ireland that have overwhelmingly on both sides said, "We want the peace process to go forward."

I urge my colleagues to vote for peace in Northern Ireland and support H. Res. 222.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WEXLER of the European Subcommittee for leading the discussion, and also Representative MCCARTHY from New York for sponsoring this legislation. We have no further speakers.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, nearly nine years ago, the people of Northern Ireland took a great step forward into building a lasting peace. The Good Friday Agreement, signed in 1998, set forth a plan for establishing a peaceful civil government for both Catholics and Protestants.

Today, we are close to ending an enmity that stretches back across centuries. With the establishment of an assembly there will be a substantial forum for the people of Northern Ireland to sort through their difference peacefully.

The years of calm since the signing of the agreement have seen developments that seemed nearly impossible decades ago. The acceptance of the Police Service of Northern Ireland by Sinn Fein in January of this year marked one of the last hurdles to the full implementation of the agreement. With one neutral force to fairly administer the law, the people of Northern Ireland can stop seeing the police as adversaries and instead see them as guardians of the peace, as it should be.

It is now critical that a final agreement be put in place so that the assembly can continue to meet and lead the people of Northern Ireland. Now that the IRA, as confirmed by third-party observers, has decommissioned its weapons, it is time for the Democratic Unionists to come together to rule in cooperation with Sinn Fein.

With so much progress made it would be a great shame to see the dissolution of a body freely elected by the people of Northern Ireland. This Congress supports blueprint for peace signed nearly a decade ago and wishes to see last democracy and tranquility in Ireland.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I too want to thank Mr. POE. And we also do not have any more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 222.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

SCOTT REED FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURT- HOUSE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 478) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 478

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, shall be known and designated as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 478.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself such time as I may consume and will be yielding to the gentleman from Kentucky very shortly.

I would appreciate very much, if this has been designated, to be recognized, and would recognize the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is great that I got the opportunity today to work with the gentleman from Iowa. We have worked on several things, and I think this is a very fitting bill.

H.R. 478 designates the Federal building and the United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky as the Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse. The bill recognizes Judge Reed's service to the legal profession.

Judge Scott Reed graduated from the University of Kentucky College of Law where he received many honors. Judge Reed's career as a jurist began in 1964, when he became Fayette Circuit Court judge. Five years later, he was elected to the Kentucky Court of Appeals, where he sat for over 7 years. During the mid 1970s, Judge Reed played an instrumental role in the recognition of Kentucky's judicial system, which created the Kentucky Supreme Court.

Judge Reed was elected to serve as the first Chief Justice of Kentucky in 1976. His opinions from the Supreme Court of Kentucky have received national acclaim for their content.

□ 1345

In 1979 he was named U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and he served as U.S. district judge until he retired in 1990.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. This is a very fitting individual and a fitting tribute to him.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER).

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his help on this legislation, something that is near and dear to my heart. I also thank the gentleman from Missouri for his nice words.

This courthouse and the naming of this courthouse is very special to many people in Kentucky because Scott Reed was a special man.

H.R. 478 is a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse." I can think of no other individual more deserving, no other public servant more worthy, and no other action more appropriate than naming the Federal courthouse in Lexington after the Honorable Scott Reed.

Prominent central Kentucky attorney, first Chief Justice of the Kentucky Supreme Court, and Federal judge, Scott Reed exemplifies the definition of honor and integrity.

Born in Lexington, Kentucky, on July 3, 1921, Scott Reed graduated with distinction from the University of Kentucky. While in college, he was editor-in-chief of the Kentucky Law Journal and awarded the order of the Coif, the highest academic award that can be given to a law graduate. He was also a member of the Phi Delta Phi Fraternity.

He achieved many honors at the University of Kentucky, culminating upon graduation as the recipient of the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Medallion, a prestigious award recognizing outstanding character and humanitarian service.

Prior to his time on the bench, Scott Reed was County Attorney. He was retained as counsel for the Fayette County School Board and distinguished himself as a trial lawyer of great integrity. He served from 1948 through 1956 as an associate professor at the University of Kentucky College of Law. From 1964 until 1969, he was judge of the First Division of the Fayette Circuit Court, the top trial court in Kentucky's second largest county. He then was elected to the Kentucky Court of Appeals, at that time the highest court in the Commonwealth.

As Chief Judge of the Kentucky Court of Appeals, Judge Reed oversaw the passage of a constitutional amendment that unified and modernized Kentucky's court system. As part of the modernization, the Court of Appeals became the Kentucky Supreme Court. Reed was elected by his fellow justices at that time to be the first Chief Justice of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. As Chief Justice, he oversaw the implementation of a constitutional amendment that led to Kentucky's having one of the most efficient court systems in the country. The Chief Justice of the Commonwealth holds equal rank with the Governor, the latter being the head of the Executive Branch and Chief Justice serving as the head of the Judiciary and its myriad of administrative offices throughout the State. Judge Reed was elected as a Fellow in the National College of the Judiciary in 1965 and was a voting member of the American Law Institute, a body of scholarly people who shape the laws of our Nation.

The opinions written by Scott Reed during his time on the Supreme Court of Kentucky have received national acclaim. Judge Reed was a frequent lecturer to the National College of Trial Judges and has achieved the highest honors that can be bestowed on a member of his profession.

In 1979 he was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to be U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. He served as a U.S. district judge until he retired in 1990, rounding out his judicial career having served on the local, State, and Federal benches. Scott Reed was named to the University of Kentucky College of Law Hall of Distinguished Alumni on April 11, 1980.

Judge Reed passed away on February 17, 1994, but his legacy will always be a part of Kentucky's rich history. He richly deserves this honor, one that is indeed long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky for being a cosponsor of this legislation. Again, I thank my colleagues from Iowa and Missouri for their help on bringing this to the floor, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would associate myself with the remarks Mr. CHANDLER made. I appreciate that. Judge Reed was truly an outstanding individual in many respects and served with great distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 478 and urge its passage.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 478, a bill to designate the Federal building located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse". The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER) and his colleague from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Scott Reed was born in Lexington, Kentucky, in 1921. He attended local schools and graduated from the University of Kentucky

College of Law in 1945. While at the University, Reed received many awards and honors, including the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Medalion for excellence.

The first years of Judge Reed's career were spent in private practice during which he distinguished himself as a trial lawyer of great integrity. During this time, he also taught at the University of Kentucky College of Law.

From 1964 to 1969, Judge Reed was judge of the First Division of the Fayette Circuit Court. From 1969 until 1976, he served on the Court of Appeals, 5th Appellate District. In 1976, Judge Reed became the Chief Justice of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, a position which holds equal rank with the Governor. His opinions from the Supreme Court of Kentucky have received national attention for their scholarly content and careful judicial reasoning.

In August, 1979, Judge Reed was nominated by President Carter to the federal bench. He was confirmed later that year and served until his death in 1994. During his confirmation hearing, Judge Reed was characterized as possessing a great sense of fairness and objectivity, practical legal experience, and great respect for the law and its responsibility to our Nation's citizens. Both Senator Huddleston and Senator Ford participated in Judge Reed's confirmation hearing.

Judge Reed enjoyed a rich and rewarding career. His contributions to the American judicial system are exceptional. It is fitting that the United States Courthouse located in Lexington, Kentucky, bear his name to honor his distinguished career and enduring legacy.

I support H.R. 478 and urge its passage.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 478.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGH L. CAREY UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 429) to designate the United States courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the "Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 429

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 429.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 429 is a bill to designate the new courthouse in Brooklyn at Cadman Plaza in honor of former Member and New York Governor Hugh Carey.

Hugh Carey began his distinguished public career in 1960 when he was elected to the House of Representatives. He served on the former Education and Labor Committee, the Interior Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee. During his seven terms, he became the deputy whip and helped pass several pieces of landmark legislation on education and the rights of the disabled.

As Governor, Carey signed the historic Willowbrook consent decree, which committed New York to sweeping reforms in the care of the developmentally disabled. He also dealt with Love Canal and pollution of the Hudson River. Along with Senator KENNEDY and former Speaker Tip O'Neill, he worked to end violence in Northern Ireland.

He is truly a son of New York, a great civic leader and esteemed public servant. For these and other reasons, it is both fitting and proper to honor Hugh Carey with this designation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 429 does designate the United States courthouse which is located at 225 Cadman Plaza East in Brooklyn, New York as the "Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse."

As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out, the Governor served in the United States Army during World War II and then received his law degree from St. John's University School of Law. In 1960 he was elected to represent the 12th Congressional District of New York in the 87th Congress and served until his resignation in 1974, when he was elected Governor of New York, and he served two terms as Governor.

I might also point out that in 1993, Governor Carey was appointed to the American Battle Monuments Commission to represent the United States at various ceremonies commemorating the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Governor Carey is currently practicing law in New York City, as I understand.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fitting tribute to Governor Carey's commitment to public service, and I wholeheartedly support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GRAVES for those kind words and appreciate his support and work on this very appropriate naming.

I urge the acceptance of H.R. 429.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 429, a bill to designate the newly-constructed courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza in Brooklyn, New York, as the "Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse".

Hugh Carey was born in 1919, in Brooklyn, where he attended local schools. He graduated from St. John's University and, in 1951, graduated from St. John's Law School. During World War II, he fought in Europe with the 104th Division. For his valor, he received the Bronze Star, Croix de Guerre, and Combat Infantry Award.

Hugh Carey served the people of New York for almost three decades, first as a Congressman representing Brooklyn and then as Governor of the State. Congressman Carey served seven terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, from 1960 until 1974. In 1974, he was elected as Governor of New York in a landslide victory. He served two full terms as Governor until being succeeded by his Lieutenant Governor, Mario Cuomo.

Carey's public career is highlighted by his handling of the city's economic crisis in the late 1970s. As part of this effort he spearheaded the construction of the Jacob Javits Center, Battery Park City, and South Street Seaport. He was a fierce opponent of the death penalty and, as Governor, prevented the reinstatement of the death penalty in the State of New York.

Carey was a master at forming coalitions between business and labor. This ability helped save the city from fiscal crisis in the late 1970s. During that time, he worked diligently to attract businesses to the State mainly by reducing State taxes.

Governor Carey, who will be 88 in April, still practices law in New York. This designation will honor the truly outstanding, civic career of one of New York's finest public servants.

I support H.R. 429 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 429.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONRAD DUBERSTEIN UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT-HOUSE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 430) to designate the United States bankruptcy courthouse located

at 271 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the "Conrad Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 430

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States bankruptcy courthouse located at 271 Cadman Plaza East in Brooklyn, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Conrad B. Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States bankruptcy courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Conrad B. Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 430.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a quote from Chief Justice John Marshall was recently used at St. John's Law School, Judge Duberstein's alma mater, to describe Judge Duberstein: "Once in a while a man mounts the bench with the salt of like, the spice of wisdom, and the sweetness of humor blended in him so subtly and yet so successfully that those who are quite unlearned in the law glimpse some of its beauties." This quote so aptly describes Judge Duberstein.

Judge Duberstein was a proud product of New York. He attended school in the Bronx, college in Brooklyn, and received his law degree from St. John's University Law School. His high school alma mater is also the alma mater of former Secretary of State Colin Powell.

The words wisdom, fairness, beloved mentor, humor, humility, and humanity are used not only to describe his life but also reflects the principles he brought to his law practice. He was a judge guided by a sense of fairness and perpetual desire for nothing but justice for all who were in his courts. His accomplishments were without bounds. Judge Duberstein practiced bankruptcy law for over six decades, and when he died in his 90s, he was the oldest surviving bankruptcy judge in the country.

Designating the courthouse in his honor is a most fitting tribute to the

extraordinary life and work of Judge Conrad B. Duberstein.

I support H.R. 430 and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to what the gentleman from Iowa pointed out, Judge Duberstein's tremendous contributions in law, I might also add to that, Judge Duberstein served in the United States Army. We have actually named a few courthouses over the last couple of months after individuals who are World War II veterans, and they are all just outstanding individuals.

Judge Duberstein did serve in the Army during World War II, and he was awarded the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Combat Infantry Badge. After the war he engaged in the private practice of law, where, again, his prominence as a bankruptcy attorney grew large.

The gentleman from Iowa pointed out his many contributions to law and obviously to the State of New York. This is another bill, Mr. Speaker, where I think it is a fitting tribute, to say the least, and I wholeheartedly support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 430 to a person very deserving.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 430, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Brooklyn, New York (Mr. TOWNS), to designate the United States Bankruptcy Courthouse located at 271 Cadman Plaza in Brooklyn, New York, as the "Conrad B. Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse".

This bill has the unanimous support of the judges of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of New York. At the time of his death, on November 18, 2005, at the age of 90, Judge Duberstein was the oldest serving Chief Bankruptcy Judge in the country.

Judge Duberstein is a native New Yorker, born in the Bronx in 1915. He was 17 years old when his father died. As a result, he dropped out of school to support his mother and two sisters. In 1934, he received his high school diploma from the Morris Evening High School. In 1938, he graduated from Brooklyn College and, in 1942, he received his law degree from St. John's University Law School. While a law student, he served on the St. John's University Law Review.

Judge Duberstein was admitted to the New York State Bar in 1942. In the same year, he took the oath for admission to practice before the United States District Court for the Eastern District in the very building which today we designate in his honor.

Judge Duberstein was drafted and served with distinction in World War II from 1943 until 1946. He was stationed in Northern Italy, where he was wounded. He was awarded the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Combat Infantry Badge. While in Italy, he had the honor of being granted an audience with Pope Pius XII.

In 1981, he was appointed to the Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District in New York. In 1984, the Board of Judges appointed him as the Chief Judge. His work was noted for its thoroughness, extensive analysis, and scholarly approach. He was a person known by his humility and humanity. He worked tirelessly to enable persons of every faith, race, and origin to achieve a "fresh start," consistent with bankruptcy laws. He was beloved and revered by his colleagues. It is both fitting and proper that the bankruptcy courthouse in Brooklyn, New York, be designated in his honor.

I support the bill and urge its passage.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 430, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the United States bankruptcy courthouse located at 271 Cadman Plaza East in Brooklyn, New York, as the 'Conrad B. Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Court-house'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1400

NEAL SMITH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1045) to designate the Federal building located at 210 Walnut Street in Des Moines, Iowa, as the "Neal Smith Federal Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1045

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 210 Walnut Street in Des Moines, Iowa, shall be known and designated as the "Neal Smith Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Neal Smith Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1045.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite a privilege today for me to stand here and speak about someone who has been my mentor and that I have admired for many, many years of my life. Neal Smith, and in fact I should say his wife, Bea, have been exemplary in so many ways and have meant so much to the people of Iowa and in fact the people of this Nation.

I would recognize that Neal served with distinction and bravery in World War II. He was a bomber pilot and was highly decorated.

Those of you here in the Congress that served with Neal know that he was highly regarded, both in Washington and in his home State of Iowa. He was known for his skillful legislating and attention to his congressional district. Having served 36 years in Congress, Neal is the longest serving Iowan to serve in the House of Representatives. Naming the Federal building in Des Moines is an honor he deserves, and the time is correct.

As chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations subcommittee, Neal spent most of his time outside the spotlight tenaciously defending programs under his jurisdiction against budget assaults.

He was rooted in Depression-era Iowa. Neal was a man of liberal instincts, but he was considered fair and an honest broker as a subcommittee chairman and was known to keep debating until an agreement could be reached. He once said, "I don't try to get confrontational. I try to do whatever I need to do to pass the bill."

Outside of appropriations, Neal was a champion for tougher meat and poultry inspection laws and introduced and supported legislation that required food labels stating sodium content. Neal was also instrumental in creating the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to guard against grain trading abuses and in setting up strict Federal procedures for grain inspection.

Back in Iowa, other tributes have been given to his honor. We now have the Neal Smith National Wildlife Refuge, the Neal Smith Trail, and the Neal and Bea Smith Law School at Drake. It is now only fitting that the Federal building in Des Moines, a building I understand he helped get funded, be named the Neal Smith Federal Building.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this moment and urge passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I could really add much to Mr. SMITH's accomplishments and what he has done, other than what Mr. BOSWELL has pointed out.

He did mention he was a bomber pilot, and I looked up his service

record. He was awarded the Purple Heart, nine Battle Stars and the Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters for his service, which is obviously a sign of a very outstanding individual. This obviously marks a long and very distinguished career. Obviously, he was one of us, a Member of Congress from Iowa; and I wholeheartedly support this.

Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the gentleman from Iowa what Mr. SMITH flew during the war?

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would just share this. That is a very good question, Mr. GRAVES. It would be either a B-17 or B-29. It was one of the bombers at least. I know that. Neal was the kind of person, as others know from here, he never spoke about it. You had to kind of dig it out to know about that. But he truly was an American hero as well as a very much respected hero in Iowa, and I suspect that a lot of his influence reached over into Missouri.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I do thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) for the kind words that he said. Again, this gentleman was a pilot, and you can't get any better than that. I would wholeheartedly support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would say this is a very special day for us in Iowa to name this building in Neal's honor. We also would say publicly and presently that we respect Bea so very much. They went to law school together at Drake and served together all these many, many years.

Mr. REGULA from Ohio was a colleague of Neal's and they served together, and he was very happy and ready to help sponsor the bill and so on. I would appreciate, Mr. GRAVES, if you will pass on to him our appreciation for his contribution and his greetings to Neal and Bea.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support and pass this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1045, a bill to designate the Federal building at 210 Walnut Street in Des Moines, IA, as the "Neal Smith Federal Building."

Neal Smith was born on March 23, 1920, in his grandparents' home near Hedrick, Keokuk County, IA. He served in the United States House of Representatives from 1959 until 1995, and has the distinction of being the longest serving Member of the House of Representatives from Iowa. Congressman Smith is a World War II veteran, having served in the United States Army Air Force as a bomber pilot. His plane was shot down during combat and he received a Purple Heart, nine Battle Stars, and the Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters.

He received his undergraduate training at the University of Missouri and Syracuse University. In 1950, he received his law degree from Drake University.

Neal Smith is one of Iowa's most respected and distinguished elected officials. His interests while serving in Congress were varied,

but he especially focused on agriculture, small business, and the environment. He became a champion for those issue areas and authored legislation establishing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Federal Meat, Poultry and Egg Inspection Acts, and Small Business Development Centers.

Congressman Smith also sponsored legislation to authorize construction of the Big Creek and Rathbun Dams. Further, he was instrumental in creating the Red Rock Watershed Conservation District and a National Wildlife Refuge that was named in his honor. In the 1980s, he was especially active in helping to jump start Iowa's stagnant economy. In 1996, Smith published his autobiography, *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington: From Eisenhower to Clinton*.

It is most fitting and proper to honor the long, distinguished civic career of Congressman Neal Smith with this designation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1045.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1045.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 64, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 228, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 222, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT BANGLADESH SHOULD DROP CHARGES AGAINST SALAH UDDIN SHOAIB CHOUDHURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 64.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 64, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 1, answered “present” 4, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Ackerman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller
Aderholt	Dicks	Kennedy
Akin	Dingell	Kildee
Alexander	Doggett	Kind
Allen	Donnelly	King (IA)
Altmire	Doolittle	King (NY)
Arcuri	Doyle	Kingston
Bachmann	Drake	Kirk
Bachus	Duncan	Klein (FL)
Baird	Edwards	Kline (MN)
Baker	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Barrett (SC)	Ellison	Kucinich
Barrow	Ellsworth	Kuhl (NY)
Bartlett (MD)	Emanuel	LaHood
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Lamborn
Bean	Engel	Lampson
Becerra	English (PA)	Langevin
Berkley	Eshoo	Lantos
Berman	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Berry	Everett	Larson (CT)
Biggert	Fallin	Latham
Bilbray	Farr	LaTourette
Bilirakis	Fattah	Lee
Bishop (GA)	Feeney	Levin
Bishop (NY)	Ferguson	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Filner	Lewis (KY)
Blackburn	Flake	Linder
Blumenauer	Forbes	Lipinski
Blunt	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Boehner	Fossella	Loeback
Bonner	Fox	Lofgren, Zoe
Bono	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lungrén, Daniel E.
Boswell	Gallegly	Lynch
Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	Mack
Boustany	Gerlach	Mahoney (FL)
Boyd (FL)	Giffords	Maloney (NY)
Boyd (KS)	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Brady (PA)	Gillibrand	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Markey
Braley (IA)	Gingrey	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Gonzalez	Matheson
Brown-Waite,	Goode	Matsui
Ginny	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Buchanan	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Burgess	Graves	McCauley (TX)
Burton (IN)	Green, Al	McCollum (MN)
Butterfield	Green, Gene	McCotter
Buyer	Grijalva	McCrery
Calvert	Gutierrez	McDermott
Camp (MI)	Hall (NY)	McGovern
Campbell (CA)	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Cannon	Hare	McHugh
Cantor	Harman	McIntyre
Capito	Hastert	McKeon
Capps	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Capuano	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Cardoza	Hayes	Meehan
Carnahan	Heller	Meek (FL)
Carney	Hensarling	Meeks (NY)
Carter	Herger	Melancon
Castle	Herseth	Mica
Castor	Higgins	Michaud
Chabot	Hinchee	Millender-
Chandler	Hinojosa	McDonald
Clarke	Hirono	Miller (MI)
Clay	Hobson	Miller (NC)
Cleaver	Hodes	Miller, Gary
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Coble	Holden	Mitchell
Cohen	Holt	Mollohan
Cole (OK)	Honda	Moore (KS)
Conyers	Hooley	Moore (WI)
Cooper	Hoyer	Moran (KS)
Costa	Hulshof	Moran (VA)
Costello	Hunter	Murphy (CT)
Courtney	Inglis (SC)	Murphy, Patrick
Cramer	Inslee	Murphy, Tim
Crenshaw	Israel	Murtha
Crowley	Issa	Musgrave
Cuellar	Jackson (IL)	Myrick
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Nadler
Davis (AL)	(TX)	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Jefferson	Neal (MA)
Davis (IL)	Jindal	Neugebauer
Davis (KY)	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
Davis, David	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar
Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Olver
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Ortiz
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Pallone
DeLauro	Jordan	Pascarell
Dent	Kagen	Pastor
	Kanjorski	

Payne	Sali	Taylor
Pearce	Sánchez, Linda	Terry
Pence	T.	Thompson (CA)
Perlmutter	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiahrt
Peterson (MN)	Sarbanes	Tiberi
Peterson (PA)	Saxton	Tierney
Petri	Schakowsky	Towns
Pickering	Schiff	Turner
Pitts	Schwartz	Udall (CO)
Platts	Scott (GA)	Udall (NM)
Poe	Scott (VA)	Upton
Pomeroy	Sensenbrenner	Van Hollen
Porter	Serrano	Velázquez
Price (GA)	Sessions	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Sestak	Walberg
Pryce (OH)	Shadegg	Walden (OR)
Putnam	Shays	Walsh (NY)
Radanovich	Shea-Porter	Walz (MN)
Rahall	Sherman	Wamp
Ramstad	Shimkus	Wasserman
Rangel	Shuler	Schultz
Regula	Shuster	Waters
Rehberg	Simpson	Watson
Reichert	Sires	Watt
Renzi	Skelton	Waxman
Reyes	Slaughter	Weiner
Reynolds	Smith (NE)	Welch (VT)
Rodriguez	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Wexler
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Rogers (MI)	Snyder	Wicker
Rohrabacher	Solis	Wilson (NM)
Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Wilson (OH)
Roskam	Space	Wilson (SC)
Ross	Spratt	Wolf
Rothman	Stark	Woolsey
Roybal-Allard	Stearns	Wu
Royce	Stupak	Wynn
Ruppersberger	Sullivan	Yarmuth
Rush	Sutton	Young (AK)
Ryan (OH)	Tancredo	Young (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Tanner	
Salazar	Tauscher	

NAYS—1

Paul

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Conaway	Hill
Gohmert	Thornberry

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Davis, Jo Ann	McMorris
Baca	Davis, Lincoln	Rodgers
Baldwin	Dreier	Miller (FL)
Brown (SC)	Granger	Schmidt
Carson	Kilpatrick	Thompson (MS)
Cubin	Lewis (GA)	Weldon (FL)
Culberson		Weller

□ 1432

Mr. GOHMERT changed his vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 186TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 228.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 228, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Davis, Tom	Jackson-Lee
Ackerman	Deal (GA)	(TX)
Aderholt	DeFazio	Jefferson
Akin	DeGette	Jindal
Alexander	Delahunt	Johnson (GA)
Allen	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Altmire	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Arcuri	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)
Bachmann	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Bachus	Dingell	Jordan
Baird	Doggett	Kagen
Baker	Donnelly	Kanjorski
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	Kaptur
Barrow	Doyle	Keller
Bartlett (MD)	Drake	Kennedy
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Kildee
Bean	Duncan	Kind
Becerra	Edwards	King (IA)
Berkley	Ehlers	Kingston
Berman	Ellison	Kirk
Berry	Ellsworth	Klein (FL)
Biggert	Emanuel	Kline (MN)
Bilbray	Emerson	Kucinich
Bilirakis	Engel	Kuhl (NY)
Bishop (GA)	English (PA)	LaHood
Bishop (NY)	Eshoo	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Etheridge	Lampson
Blackburn	Everett	Langevin
Blumenauer	Fallin	Lantos
Blunt	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Boehner	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Bonner	Feeney	Latham
Bono	Ferguson	Regula
Boozman	Filner	Rehberg
Boren	Flake	Lee
Boswell	Forbes	Levin
Boucher	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Fossella	Lewis (GA)
Boyd (FL)	Fox	Lewis (KY)
Boyd (KS)	Frank (MA)	Linder
Brady (PA)	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Braley (IA)	Gallegly	Loeb
Brown, Corrine	Garrett (NJ)	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Gerlach	Lowe
Buchanan	Giffords	Lucas
Burgess	Gillibrand	Lungren, Daniel
Burton (IN)	Gillmor	E.
Butterfield	Gingrey	Lynch
Buyer	Gohmert	Mack
Calvert	Gonzalez	Mahoney (FL)
Camp (MI)	Goode	Maloney (NY)
Campbell (CA)	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Cannon	Gordon	Marchant
Cantor	Granger	Markey
Capito	Green, Al	Marshall
Capps	Green, Gene	Matheson
Capuano	Grijalva	Matsui
Cardoza	Gutierrez	McCarthy (CA)
Carnahan	Hall (NY)	McCarthy (NY)
Carney	Hall (TX)	McCauley (TX)
Carson	Hare	McCollum (MN)
Carter	Harman	McCotter
Castle	Hastert	McCrery
Castor	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	McGovern
Chandler	Hayes	McHenry
Clarke	Heller	McHugh
Clay	Hensarling	McIntyre
Cleaver	Herger	McKeon
Clyburn	Herseth	McMorris
Coble	Higgins	Rodgers
Cohen	Hill	McNerney
Cole (OK)	Hinche	McNulty
Conaway	Hinojosa	Meehan
Conyers	Hirono	Meek (FL)
Cooper	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Costa	Hodes	Melancon
Costello	Hoekstra	Mica
Courtney	Holden	Michaud
Cramer	Holt	Millender-
Crenshaw	Honda	McDonald
Crowley	Hooley	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Hoyer	Miller (NC)
Cummings	Hulshof	Miller, Gary
Davis (AL)	Hunter	Miller, George
Davis (CA)	Inglis (SC)	Mitchell
Davis (IL)	Issa	Mollohan
Davis (KY)	Israel	Moore (KS)
Davis, David	Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)
		Moran (KS)
		Moran (VA)

Murphy (CT)	Rogers (KY)	Stearns
Murphy, Patrick	Rogers (MI)	Stupak
Murphy, Tim	Rohrabacher	Sullivan
Murtha	Ros-Lehtinen	Sutton
Musgrave	Roskam	Tancredo
Myrick	Ross	Tanner
Nadler	Rothman	Tauscher
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Taylor
Neal (MA)	Royce	Terry
Neugebauer	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Nunes	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Oberstar	Ryan (OH)	Thornberry
Obey	Ryan (WI)	Tiahrt
Oliver	Salazar	Tiberi
Ortiz	Sali	Tierney
Pallone	Sánchez, Linda	Towns
Pascarella	T.	Turner
Pastor	Sanchez, Loretta	Udall (CO)
Paul	Sarbanes	Udall (NM)
Payne	Saxton	Upton
Pearce	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Pence	Schiff	Velázquez
Perlmutter	Schwartz	Visclosky
Peterson (MN)	Scott (GA)	Walden (OR)
Peterson (PA)	Scott (VA)	Walsh (NY)
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Walz (MN)
Pickering	Serrano	Wamp
Pitts	Sessions	Wasserman
Platts	Shadegg	Schultz
Poe	Shays	Waters
Pomeroy	Shea-Porter	Watson
Porter	Sherman	Watt
Price (GA)	Shimkus	Waxman
Price (NC)	Shuler	Weiner
Pryce (OH)	Shuster	Westmoreland
Putham	Simpson	Wexler
Radanovich	Sires	Whitfield
Rahall	Slaughter	Wicker
Ramstad	Smith (NE)	Wilson (NM)
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
Regula	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Reichert	Snyder	Woolsey
Renzi	Solis	Wu
Reyes	Souder	Wynn
Reynolds	Space	Yarmuth
Rodriguez	Spratt	Young (AK)
Rogers (AL)	Stark	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Baca	Gilchrest	Sestak
Baldwin	Graves	Skelton
Brown (SC)	Kilpatrick	Walberg
Cubin	King (NY)	Welch (VT)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Weldon (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann	Miller (FL)	Weller
Davis, Lincoln	Schmidt	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1439

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 140, I whole-heartedly support recognizing the 186th anniversary of the independence of Greece celebrating Greek and American Democracy. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE FOR THE GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 222.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 222, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hinchey
Ackerman	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Aderholt	Cummings	Hirono
Akin	Davis (AL)	Hobson
Alexander	Davis (CA)	Hodes
Allen	Davis (IL)	Hoekstra
Altmire	Davis, David	Holden
Andrews	Davis, Lincoln	Holt
Arcuri	Davis, Tom	Honda
Bachmann	Deal (GA)	Hooley
Bachus	DeFazio	Hoyer
Baird	DeGette	Hulshof
Baker	Delahunt	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	DeLauro	Inglis (SC)
Barrow	Dent	Inslee
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Israel
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Bean	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Berkley	Doggett	(TX)
Berman	Donnelly	Jefferson
Berry	Doolittle	Jindal
Biggert	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Bilbray	Drake	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (GA)	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Jones (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Blackburn	Ellison	Jordan
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Kagen
Blunt	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Boehner	Emerson	Kaptur
Bonner	Engel	Keller
Bono	English (PA)	Kennedy
Boozman	Eshoo	Kildee
Boren	Etheridge	Kind
Boswell	Everett	King (IA)
Boucher	Fallin	King (NY)
Boustany	Farr	Kingston
Boyd (FL)	Fattah	Kirk
Boyd (KS)	Feeney	Klein (FL)
Brady (PA)	Ferguson	Kline (MN)
Brady (TX)	Filner	Knollenberg
Braley (IA)	Flake	Kucinich
Brown, Corrine	Forbes	Kuhl (NY)
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Fortenberry	LaHood
Buchanan	Fossella	Lamborn
Burgess	Fox	Lampson
Burton (IN)	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Butterfield	Franks (AZ)	Lantos
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Calvert	Gallegly	Larson (CT)
Camp (MI)	Garrett (NJ)	Latham
Campbell (CA)	Gerlach	LaTourette
Cannon	Giffords	Lee
Cantor	Gilchrest	Levin
Capito	Gillibrand	Lewis (CA)
Capps	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Capuano	Gingrey	Lewis (KY)
Cardoza	Gohmert	Linder
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Carney	Goode	LoBiondo
Carson	Goodlatte	Loeb
Carter	Gordon	Loeb
Castle	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Castor	Graves	Lowey
Chabot	Green, Al	Lucas
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lungren, Daniel
Clarke	Grijalva	E.
Clay	Gutierrez	Lynch
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	Mack
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)
Coble	Hare	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Harman	McCauley (TX)
Cole (OK)	Hastert	McCollum (MN)
Conaway	Hastings (FL)	McCotter
Conyers	Hastings (WA)	McCrery
Cooper	Hayes	
Costa	Heller	
Costello	Hensarling	
Courtney	Herger	
Cramer	Herseth	
Crenshaw	Higgins	
Crowley	Hill	

McDermott	Porter	Smith (TX)
McGovern	Price (GA)	Smith (WA)
McHenry	Price (NC)	Snyder
McHugh	Pryce (OH)	Solis
McIntyre	Putnam	Souder
McKeon	Radanovich	Space
McMorris	Rahall	Spratt
Rodgers	Ramstad	Stark
McNerney	Rangel	Stearns
McNulty	Regula	Stupak
Meehan	Rehberg	Sullivan
Meek (FL)	Reichert	Sutton
Meeks (NY)	Renzi	Tancredo
Melancon	Reyes	Tanner
Mica	Reynolds	Tauscher
Michaud	Rodriguez	Taylor
Millender-	Rogers (AL)	Terry
McDonald	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Miller (NC)	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Miller, George	Roskam	Tiberi
Mitchell	Ross	Tierney
Mollohan	Rothman	Towns
Moore (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Moore (WI)	Royce	Udall (CO)
Moran (KS)	Ruppersberger	Udall (NM)
Moran (VA)	Rush	Upton
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Murphy, Patrick	Ryan (WI)	Velázquez
Murphy, Tim	Salazar	Vislosky
Murtha	Sali	Walberg
Musgrave	Sánchez, Linda	Walden (OR)
Myrick	T.	Walsh (NY)
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz (MN)
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Wamp
Neal (MA)	Saxton	Wasserman
Neugebauer	Schakowsky	Schultz
Nunes	Schiff	Waters
Oberstar	Schwartz	Watson
Obey	Scott (GA)	Watt
Olver	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Weiner
Pallone	Serrano	Welch (VT)
Pascarella	Sessions	Westmoreland
Pastor	Sestak	Wexler
Payne	Shadegg	Whitfield
Pearce	Shays	Wicker
Pence	Shea-Porter	Wilson (NM)
Perlmutter	Sherman	Wilson (OH)
Peterson (MN)	Shinkus	Wilson (SC)
Peterson (PA)	Shuler	Wolf
Petri	Shuster	Woolsey
Pickering	Simpson	Wu
Pitts	Sires	Wynn
Platts	Slaughter	Yarmuth
Poe	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—13

Baca	Davis (KY)	Skelton
Baldwin	Davis, Jo Ann	Weldon (FL)
Brown (SC)	Kilpatrick	Weller
Cubin	Miller (FL)	
Culberson	Schmidt	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1448

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official leave of absence, I was unable to vote on three bills considered today under suspension of the rules. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H. Res. 64, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Bangladesh should immediately drop all pending

charges against Bangladeshi journalist Salah Uddin Shoaib Choudhury; "yea" on final passage of H. Res. 228, Recognizing the 186th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy, and "yea" on final passage of H. Res. 222, Expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the Good Friday Agreement, signed on April 10, 1998, as a blueprint for a lasting peace in Northern Ireland, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that I be excused from today's votes due to official business at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. I regret that I was not able to cast these votes; however, if I had been present I would have voted in the following way: "yea" on H. Res. 64; "yea" on H. Res. 228; "yea" on H. Res. 222.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139 on final passage of H. Res. 64, rollcall No. 140 on final passage of H. Res. 228, and rollcall No. 141 on final passage of H. Res. 222, I am not recorded because I was absent due to attendance at a family funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of the rollcall votes.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Melody McEntee, Director, Government, Business and Community Relations, Office of Hon. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with an administrative subpoena, issued by the United States Merit Systems Protection Board, for testimony and documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

MELODY MCENTEE,
Director, Government, Business
and Community Relations.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSIONAL CONSTITUTION CAUCUS' WEEKLY "CONSTITUTION HALF HOUR"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to announce our support of the A-PLUS Act authored by my good friend from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). I stand here as the founder and chairman of the Congressional Constitution Caucus, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

Normally, when I begin my weekly floor speeches, I quote the relevant portion of the Constitution that corresponds with the evening's topic. Yet today I have difficulty choosing a coinciding article and section from our founding document. You see, the Constitution does not contain the word "school" or even "education." Contrary to common modern misconceptions, there is no constitutional right guaranteeing each citizen an education.

Now, this does not mean education is unimportant or that the Constitution is silent on the issue. The 10th amendment unambiguously states, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Historically, in the United States, education has not fallen under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Parents, local schools and the States were responsible for children's academic training. It has only been in the last 50 years or so has the Federal Government begun overstepping its constitutional boundaries by parading the increasing bureaucracies of the Department of Education.

Mr. HOEKSTRA's bill seeks to correct many of the problems associated with a Federal bureaucracy by putting control over education money back into the hands of the taxpayers and, most importantly, the parents.

Under the current system, the Federal Government essentially bribes States into complying with the burdensome No Child Left Behind program. Yes, States can opt out of these regulations, but doing so would mean losing millions of dollars in aid every year.

Under its bill, first it will free States from following needless Federal regulations and mandates. Currently, the No Child Left Behind program restricts academic innovation and ignores the diversity present in each State, region and school district.

Secondly, A-PLUS Act will reduce the amount of time and money that school officials currently devote to complying with these mandates. Each

hour and dollar spent in administering No Child Left Behind could be funneled instead into improving our schools.

Thirdly, A-PLUS Act will ensure that parents, schools and the States are held accountable for the education process. Rather than allowing oversight to rest in some far-flung bureaucracies here in Washington, it will be right at home here in your local school district. But most importantly, giving States the freedom to keep their education dollars in oversight within their own State is exactly what our Founding Fathers originally intended.

James Madison, often considered the father of the Constitution, will be remembered this coming Friday, March 16, on the 250th anniversary of his birth.

In a way, Madison predicted this situation we now find ourselves in, when he wrote, "In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself."

It is time for us to explain why we are not controlling ourselves. Our Founding Fathers deliberately wrote a Constitution of enumerated specific powers. While some countries have attempted to limit government by writing Constitutions that specify every single thing and every single line, our government Constitution does not do that. Therefore, in Article I, Section 8, the founders specifically listed congressional powers, and in the 10th amendment grants that all other legislative powers are in the hands of States or the people respectively.

So, in essence, it makes sense that Congress should perform duties only prescribed by the Constitution. When you think about it, the United States has thrived as a nation precisely because the freedom of the people has been protected by a limited government. The Constitution is the anchor that protects American citizens from the storms of a controlling central government.

James Madison wrote also in *The Federalist* No. 45, "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined." He would add, probably, that education is not one of them. So Mr. HOEKSTRA's common-sense legislation follows Madison's insights by ensuring that the States have the opportunity to retain control over their own education dollars. Doing so will not only improve the quality of the education system, but will help return our Nation to the principles of limited government, federalism, and the 10th amendment.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SHORT SEA SHIPPING PROMOTION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, when I assumed the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation at the beginning of the 110th Congress, I promised that the subcommittee would balance oversight of the Coast Guard with our responsibility to strengthen maritime transportation.

On February 15, the subcommittee began to fulfill that promise by holding a hearing on short sea shipping, which is the waterborne transportation of goods and people from one domestic port in the United States to another port in the United States or between Canada and the U.S.

At the present time, trucks carry nearly 70 percent of the freight tonnage transported in the United States. By contrast, the most highly developed water freight transportation routes in the United States, those running on the Mississippi River, the Great Lakes and the Saint Lawrence Seaway carry just 13 percent of the freight tonnage within the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of our continued reliance on trucks to move freight will be measured in increased traffic congestion, increases in polluting emissions and increases in accidents between trucks and cars.

However, the only way that we will shift freight transportation away from an increasing volume of trucks is by creating affordable reliable transportation alternatives. I believe that one of these alternatives must be short sea shipping.

During our February hearing, our subcommittee heard compelling testimony arguing that one of the challenges currently limiting the growth of short sea shipping is a requirement that with only a few exceptions cargo transported by water to a port in the United States must pay the harbor maintenance tax. This tax, assessed at the rate of \$125 per \$100,000 of cargo value adds to the costs associated with waterborne transportation and is one factor currently making such transportation less competitive than trucks and other modes.

Importantly, if the cargo originated in Europe and is off-loaded in New York, just to be reloaded on a ship bound for Jacksonville, Florida then the cargo owner must pay the harbor tax twice.

□ 1500

Further, the tax is paid, not by the ship owner, but by the shipper of the goods. So imagine that a FedEx truck wants to get on a ferry in Windsor, Canada, and be off loaded just across the river in Detroit, Michigan. Each of the owners of the 500 packages that are in the truck must pay the harbor maintenance tax. There is simply no easy way to collect the tax from so many different packages, so the truck travels to the United States across the bridge.

In part, because it acts to limit the growth of short sea shipping, the har-

bor maintenance tax generates only about \$2 million per year in revenue from short sea shipping voyages, but stands as a costly barrier to the expansion of short sea shipping options.

Today, therefore, I have introduced the Short Sea Shipping Promotion Act of 2007, which would exempt goods moved by water from one port in the United States to another port in the United States or between the United States and Canada from the harbor maintenance tax.

This exemption will not significantly reduce revenues into the harbor maintenance trust fund, which already has a significant fund balance, but could help open a significant new course for the movement of freight by water.

Our Nation urgently needs to take practical steps to address the significant challenges we face in maintaining the flow of freight on which our economy depends.

As chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, the measure I have introduced today is just the first step of a concerted and deliberate effort I will undertake to support the potential of maritime transportation, in general, and short sea shipping, in particular, to be a reliable, cost-effective mode in our national transportation network.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A-PLUS ACT (NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND REFORM)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address important changes to the No Child Left Behind Act. I recently held a roundtable discussion on this issue with my constituents from all over the Fifth District held in Forsyth County, North Carolina. It was a great opportunity for me to hear from superintendents, board of education members, principals and teachers from across the district about their concerns with No Child Left Behind and their recommendations for program improvements.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, it was important for me to hear firsthand what educators believe is working and is not working in No Child Left Behind.

One of the main concerns brought to me during this roundtable was the role that special education students play in the Federal oversight process. Due to the wide-ranging needs and challenges faced by special needs students, it is becoming increasingly difficult for schools to meet Federal standards.

It is apparent that the subgroup of special needs students is not accounted for in the way No Child Left Behind enforces standards on a state-wide basis. In fact, the unique needs of special needs students is often the only reason many of North Carolina's excellent schools do not reach AYP, or average yearly progress.

Based on what North Carolina's educators are saying, the A-PLUS Act is a step in the right direction that responds to the needs of our teachers and students.

The A-PLUS Act preserves States rights while keeping essential funding for our schools intact.

Instead of cumbersome Federal mandates that take a cookie-cutter approach to education, the A-PLUS Act would give States the constitutional freedom to set their own education policies, based on the needs of their students, without burdensome Federal Government intrusion.

This bill reduces the burden that Federal financial support poses on education programs so that teachers can focus on educating instead of paperwork and bureaucratic mandates. We have many wonderful teachers out there doing their best every day to do their job, and they are distracted from doing their job by this paperwork.

By giving States back their full constitutional right to set education policy, this bill will encourage innovative solutions to the unique education issues faced by every State.

The A-PLUS Act provides States and their local communities with maximum freedom and flexibility to determine how to improve academic achievement and implement education reforms.

State and local governments should be in control of education policies, and the Federal Government's limits the responsibility should lie in providing incentives and accountability. Thus, A-PLUS allows States and local school systems the freedom to set up local accountability plans.

In conclusion, local accountability places the emphasis where it should be, on students, parents and teachers, instead of on an often unresponsive Federal bureaucracy.

And I want to support the comments made by my colleague from New Jersey, who reminds us that the Constitution doesn't have the word "education" anywhere in it. It is not the role of the Federal Government to provide for the education of our children. It is the role of the States, the localities and parents, and I applaud him for bringing that to our attention. We need to have that brought to our attention every time the Federal Government starts getting involved in an inappropriate way.

APPEAL FOR ENACTMENT OF THE EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). Under a previous order of

the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my continued support for the Employee Free Choice Act, a bill which the House passed 2 weeks ago which I hope the Senate will soon consider.

I was proud to support House passage of the Employee Free Choice Act because I believe that the current law places undue burdens on workers who are trying to exercise their rights to organize.

Under the current law, workers are often subject to intimidation, and employers receive a slap on the hand for illegal activities. One study recently conducted by the University of Illinois found that 30 percent of employers fire pro-union workers, 49 percent threaten to close a work site, and 51 percent coerce employees with bribes or favoritism.

Because of these acts, many workers are afraid to vote for a union against the wishes of their employer, even in private.

If those statistics are not compelling enough, I urge my colleagues to consider the fact that the United States is the only industrialized Nation to have a union avoidance industry of any size. This industry, on which corporations spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year, exists solely to help businesses resist unionization efforts and undermine union strength.

The Employee Free Choice Act would close the legal and illegal avenues to intimidation that some employers use, thereby strengthening employees' ability to choose.

It would discourage the firing of employees by increasing fines and penalties during the election process. It would guarantee that first contract negotiations don't drag out for years by requiring mediation and arbitration to end delays.

The Employee Free Choice Act would allow the use of card check procedures, in which a majority of workers, not just a majority of voters, sign cards authorizing a union.

Why is it so important to ensure access to unions? Inequality is rising in our country. Two years ago, Alan Greenspan said: "A free market society is ill served by an economy in which the rewards are distributed in a way which too many of our population do not feel is appropriate."

Whether or not you agree that increasing inequality in our country is tied to declining union membership, one thing is clear: unionized workers have better rates of health care coverage, better wages, and are five times more likely to have a pension.

Access to health care, better wages, secure pension: these are the things the House is trying to give back to the middle class in America. Making our economy work for everyone is a complicated, ongoing process. The Employee Free Choice Act is one impor-

tant step we can take toward accomplishing that goal.

In many American workplaces, the process of forming a union is contentious. Yet, though they may differ over issues like wages, health care and pensions, employees, supervisors, and company owners are all striving for the same goal, to make their company work and for competitiveness in a global economy.

Finding a middle ground on questions of compensation, training and health care boosts American productivity, innovation, and competitiveness. When employers control the outcome, we not only cheat workers; we cheat our economic future.

As we approach 2020, our income distribution is trending toward that of 1920. Americans don't want to be left to the market-based whims of health savings accounts, privatized Social Security, or personal job retraining accounts. They want a government that ensures that individuals can provide for themselves and their families.

Senator Wagner wrote the National Labor Relations Act in 1934 to ensure that workers would have an unambiguous, unmitigated right to representation in the workplace. He said then that "the denial or observance of this right means the difference between despotism and democracy."

It is unfortunate that the Employee Free Choice Act faces obstacles in the Senate, but it is time to give Americans a fair shot at organizing again. Everyone deserves protection under the law.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support the Employee Free Choice Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO MILITARY SOLUTION TO IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, one of the truest statements about the occupation of Iraq was uttered by one of our own generals.

The commander of U.S. troops in Iraq, General David Petraeus, said that there is no military solution in Iraq. In his own words, and I quote him, "There is no military solution to a problem like that in Iraq, to the insurgency of Iraq."

I ask all of us, Is this another case of the President not listening to his top brass? When is he going to learn that, despite the brave and courageous efforts of our men and women in uniform, we cannot bomb, we cannot shoot our way to peace in Iraq?

General Petraeus even said that we should be refocusing our diplomatic efforts in and around Iraq, saying that talks should include, and I quote him again, "some of those who have felt the new Iraq did not have a place for them."

I applaud him for his candor. He sees what is going on on the ground. He knows that the current approach is just not working.

The men and women under his command have given so much for this misguided occupation. They went in without armor they needed for their Humvees and even for their own bodily protection. They went in looking for weapons of mass destruction that did not work out too well. They went in to accomplish a mission that was not clearly defined, and there was no exit plan. How can we ask our troops to continue down this road?

The Bush administration, as we have seen in the reports about Walter Reed, has even failed our troops when they come home. Shame on the President. Shame on Veterans Affairs Secretary Nicholson. This is not the way to care for those who have given so very much.

The American people know what to do, even if lawmakers are slow to act. Overwhelming numbers in poll after poll say that we need to bring our troops home and end this disastrous foray into foreign policy. And we just don't need the polls to tell us that. Look at the calls, look at the letters, look at the e-mails that come into our offices. People are demanding that the White House wake up to reality and put an end to this mission, a mission that was not accomplished.

The best way to honor the legacy of those who have given their lives in this

occupation is to bring our troops home and work with the international community to strengthen and promote security in Iraq. It is the mandate from the American people, and it is the Congress's moral obligation.

□ 1515

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity, and I am pleased to have yielded to my good friend earlier and think that she brings into perspective some of the differences that we have in this Chamber that I would like to chat about for a little bit this afternoon.

It is a great privilege to come to the floor of the House and to present another edition of the Official Truth Squad. One of the goals that we have on our side of the aisle is to bring some light, bring some truth to the discussions that we have here on the floor of the House, so important if we are going to be making decisions, when we make decisions, on behalf of the American people.

I represent the Sixth District of Georgia, which is a wonderful district, all northern portion of suburban Atlanta. And from the very youngest to the very oldest, they give me great enthusiasm, and I am heartened by the opportunity to represent that district. It is one of the districts that has one of the greatest amounts of interest in and numbers of individuals who desire appointment to our Nation's military academies.

One of the privileges of being a Member of Congress is the opportunity to nominate individuals who avail themselves of the opportunity and have certain accomplishments at their young age to be able to be considered for appointments to military academies. Most of us get somewhere between four and eight individuals appointed to military academies each year; I was privileged last year to get over 25 people from my district appointed to the United States military academies.

When I was given the opportunity to call those folks who had been appointed, I asked my staff to put together the list, and I thought I would kind of be able to knock that out in about 1 to 1½ hours, calling those 25 or so folks who had reached an incredible accomplishment in their life. And I started down that list, and the first call was an extremely emotional call, very moving, because this individual had worked his entire life to be able to have the opportunity to serve his Nation.

And so by the end of that phone call, which lasted about 10 minutes, he was crying and I was crying; and we were

all celebrating his wonderful accomplishment. And I moved on to the next call, and it was basically a repeat of that first one, and I realized that it was going to take a long time to be able to make those wonderfully exciting and accomplishment calls. And I recognized that there are young men and women across this Nation who recognize and appreciate the value of service and the importance of making certain that there are members all across our society who stand up to serve, who stand up and appreciate the beauty and the wonder and the awe that is the United States of America. And they are proud to serve; they are proud to be able to attend one of our military academies and make that kind of commitment.

At another end of the spectrum, I have also some advisory councils in my district, different members of our community who get together and assist me in making sure that I am formulating the kinds of proposals and policies that are consistent with that wonderful Sixth District of Georgia; and recently we met.

One of the groups I have is a military and veterans group that gets together and provides information to make certain that we are addressing the kinds of issues that are of concern to military and veterans, members in the Sixth District and across the Nation. These are true heroes. They are folks kind of at the other end of the spectrum from those young men and women who have volunteered to attend military academies. But these are men and women who have served and who recognize the commitment that it takes and recognize the importance of this Congress, of this Nation stating clearly, through both word and deed, that they respect and appreciate the kind of service of our military men and women.

And those folks told me recently, they said, Congressman PRICE, we are a little perplexed, we are a little concerned by what we hear coming out of Washington. Again, these are heroes of a past time for our United States, continued heroes, but they are concerned because they believe that the information that is being put forward and the policies that are being promoted by the new majority party here in Washington as it relates to our Nation's security are troubling to them and threaten truly our very existence as a Nation.

I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the most recent proposal as it relates to our war on terror as a Nation, is a proposal that has been coined and termed "slow bleed," slow bleed in terms of our efforts in Iraq. It kind of gives you just chills thinking about that term, doesn't it, Madam Speaker? The slow bleed policy that has been put forward by Members on the other side of the aisle, they are very troubled by this at home; and I am very troubled by it. And that is what the Official Truth Squad, part of our purpose is trying to bring light and truth to the debate as it goes on here in Washington.

We have some favorite sayings on the Official Truth Squad. This is one of them. It comes from Senator Patrick Moynihan, who was the United States Senator from the State of New York. He said, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts." And, Madam Speaker, we would go a long way here in Washington if we heeded this statement and belief by Senator Moynihan: everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts. We hear a lot of opinions here, and it would be wonderful if the majority of them were more supported by facts.

One of the facts, though, is that the majority party here has the power of the purse; and if they so desire to bleed our troops dry in their mission, which is the mission of all Americans, which is to preserve and protect and defend our Nation; if they desire to slow bleed our troops, then they have the power to do that. They have the power to do that. And that is why it is called the slow bleed policy, because it would bleed dry our troops in terms of the ability for them to defend our Nation.

I quote, Madam Speaker, from Representative JOHN MURTHA on February 15 of this year when he was asked about this strategy. And he said: "They won't be able to continue," they, referring to the United States troops, our military. He said, Madam Speaker: "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

What a sad commentary it is, Madam Speaker, when you have the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that has jurisdiction over our military talking about a mission that our military is on to defend freedom and to defend you and to defend me, and say proudly, "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment." Madam Speaker, that is a sad commentary on the level of discourse and the level of involvement and the level of support that this new majority party has for our military.

And then when asked just 2 weeks later, this same individual, same Member of Congress, was asked by a member of the press, Why not cut off the funding for the war? And at this point he said, "Well, you can't. You can't go forth. The public doesn't want that. They don't want that to happen." They don't want that to happen. But then the Speaker of the House reaffirmed her support for Mr. MURTHA's policies.

The greatest amount of truth and light on this issue comes from an individual who stands tall and proud when he talks about the truth and talks about defending our Nation, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN from Connecticut. When the Speaker said, "Democrats have proposed a different course of action; over and over again we have suggested a different plan," then Senator LIEBERMAN said, "Any alternatives that I have heard ultimately don't work. They are all about failing, they

are all about withdrawing. And I think allowing Iraq to collapse would be a disaster for the Iraqis, for the Middle East, and for us." That is a little truth, Madam Speaker, on an issue that is so incredibly important to us as a Nation and to us as it relates to the stability in the Middle East, and, yes, to the world, to world stability and world peace.

I am so proud to be joined today by many of my colleagues to talk about the policies of the other side, to talk about the war on terror, to talk about defending our Nation and freedom and liberty. And the first individual to join us here on the Official Truth Squad is my good friend JOHN KLINE from Minnesota who knows of what he speaks. Colonel KLINE, we are so proud to have you join us today, and I look forward to your comments.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank Dr. PRICE for yielding and for really exerting the leadership to take the floor week after week and shine the light of truth on a lot of the obfuscation which, unfortunately, takes place on this floor and in this House.

We had the opportunity to chat a little bit today about the Democrat Party's plan here in the upcoming weeks with the supplemental funding and, in general, their plans for the war against Islamist extremists, the war, if you will, which is being certainly heavily fought in Iraq. And they do kind of have a plan. Their plan is not a plan for victory, however, and that is what I think we need to keep in mind. Their plan simply says: get out; get out of Iraq. And that is not a plan for victory.

There is a very interesting headline; perhaps you had a chance to talk about it before I made it down to the floor. In the Los Angeles Times editorial, it starts with a little headline that says: "Do we really need a General Pelosi?" I will quote: "Imagine if Dwight Eisenhower had been forced to adhere to a congressional war plan in scheduling the Normandy landing, or if, in 1863, President Lincoln had been forced by Congress to conclude the Civil War the following year. This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in military strategy." The Los Angeles Times, not the place I would normally go to find criticism of the Democrat majority.

Well, I think that you and I would certainly concur that we don't need a General PELOSI. But we do have a general. We have a new general on the ground in Iraq, General David Petraeus, named by the Commander in Chief to execute this new strategy in Iraq, and confirmed, by the way, with no dissenting votes in the United States Senate.

Let me just go through a few quotes that the new commander has shared with us in the last couple of months. This is General David Petraeus, the commander of multi-national forces in Iraq, senior commander on the ground. In looking at what would happen if we precipitously withdrew from Iraq, he said, a number of other potential out-

comes, none of which are positive, could occur: "Sectarian groups would obviously begin to stake out their turf, try to expand their turf. They would do that by greatly increased ethnic cleansing."

On another occasion he said: "The very real possibility of involvement of countries from elsewhere in the region around Iraq entering Iraq to take sides with one or the other groups."

A new quote: "The possibility of an international terrorist organization truly getting a grip on some substantial piece of Iraq."

New quote: "There is the possibility of problems in the global economy, should in fact this cause a disruption to the flow of oil," and so forth.

We have a general on the ground, I would say to my colleagues, and it is General David Petraeus, and it should not be either General PELOSI or, for that matter, anybody else in this body. We cannot, we cannot prosecute foreign policy at all and certainly a military operation with 535, or maybe it is 540 with the delegates voting, different Commanders in Chief. You cannot run an operation like this by committee. And I think it would behoove us, certainly as Members of this body, but as American people, to go with the Constitution, recognize that the Commander in Chief is in fact elected by the Nation to be that, and to abide by one of the fundamental principles of military operations, and that is unity of command. That is now being exercised by the Commander in Chief overall, and by General David Petraeus in Iraq.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And I appreciate, Congressman KLINE, your perspective in bringing light to one of the important fundamental principles of our Nation.

□ 1530

And that is that the responsibility for controlling our military, waging war, rests with the Commander in Chief, with the executive branch. And as you know, our good friend Congressman BLUNT from Missouri, our minority whip, Republican whip, he is fond of saying, look, when the Nation began under the Articles of Confederation, there was no Commander in Chief. And the first thing that was easy to do once the Constitutional Convention organized to try to put together a Nation that would survive, one of the first things they were able to do, almost without dissent, was to provide that the executive branch would be the Commander in Chief because you can't fight a war with 535 generals.

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Yes. And I am smiling a little bit, but of course we learned a very tough and bitter lesson when we tried to use the Continental Congress to, in fact, command the Army of the soon-to-be the United States and it did not work well. We would be foolish to try to duplicate that now. And, in fact, the proposed

supplemental, which we can talk about in a little more detail perhaps a little later in this hour, is an attempt to dictate the tactics that are being involved. It is micromanaging the war. It is taking away the resources that our troops need.

I wonder if I could take just a minute of our time here. I know that I have been a big supporter and I am sure you have of a bill sponsored by our colleague, a real American hero, Congressman SAM JOHNSON from Texas, who, as my colleagues know, spent 7 years as a prisoner of war in Hanoi and understands the stakes here as well as I am sure anybody in America. He has a bill that this entire body ought to get behind. It cuts to the heart of the matter and reassures our troops, our allies, and our enemies that we are not going to undercut our troops. So if I could just read a little bit of that bill because I think that that is what we should be about. I will skip a couple of paragraphs, all of which are important, talking about previous acts and resolutions of Congress, but picking up on subparagraph (4), it says: "Members of the United States Armed Forces have served honorably in their mission to fight terrorism and protect the greater security of the United States.

"These members of the Armed Forces and their families have made many sacrifices, in many cases the ultimate sacrifice, to protect the security of the United States and the freedom Americans hold dear.

"Congress and the American people are forever grateful to the members of the Armed Forces for the service they have provided to the United States."

In that light it says: "Faithful support of Congress—Congress will not cut off or restrict funding for units and members of the Armed Forces that the Commander in Chief has deployed in harm's way in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom."

And that is the road that we ought to be going forward on. I would hope that more and more of our colleagues would sign onto this bill and that this really awful effort to take central funding away from our men and women who are, as we stand here now on this floor, engaged in protecting our freedoms and advancing the cause of liberty around the world, to keep that funding from being taken away from them.

I have talked to Sam many times. He and I are a part of an ever-dwindling group of Vietnam veterans in this body, and he and I and others have watched what happens when our young men and women go fight and give it their all and have the rug pulled out from under them by politicians in Washington, D.C.

We watched what happens when combat operations are run from Washington, D.C., and it doesn't matter whether it is being run from the White House situation room, as bombing targets were selected sort of famously by President Johnson, or whether it is dic-

tating from the floor of this House. We should not let that happen. And since this is the Official Truth Squad, I think that our colleagues need to understand that that is at the core of what this very dangerous supplemental bill has added. It is a terrible micromanaging of the war, and it will be forcing, forcing, our defeat in Iraq. And, unfortunately, with that defeat the war doesn't just end. We are still in a war that is going to last a long time against radical Islam, against jihadists. Were we to suffer defeat in Iraq, the war becomes tougher for us, not easier.

And I see we are joined by some of our colleagues.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Maybe you could stick around and we can talk a little more about that supplemental and the slow-bleed policy.

I recall the comment that was made just a little earlier, Madam Speaker, by a friend on the other side of the aisle where she was quoting a general saying there was "no military solution" in Iraq. And, in fact, that is true. There is no isolated military solution. But that doesn't mean that the military doesn't have a role because it is a three-pronged strategy, which is military, economic, and political. And we are striving in all those areas to make certain that that area of the world is much more stable and much more secure so that we are much more stable and much more secure.

With that I am pleased to welcome my good friend VIRGINIA FOXX from North Carolina. I thank you for joining us today, and I look forward to your perspective and your conversation on this issue.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank you, Congressman PRICE, for continuing to make sure that the Official Truth Squad is represented here in Special Orders and that we continue to hold the majority accountable for telling the truth. They forget that a good part of the time; so I am very pleased to continue to be a member of the Official Truth Squad.

My colleague has shared some of the concerns that I have already with this legislation that we are talking about that nobody has actually seen, the supplemental war funding bill that we think that the Democrats are going to unveil this week. We believe that it is laden with a great deal of unnecessary pork which is being used to buy votes on behalf of the Democrats to try to get the legislation passed. It is also, I think, out there to try to make us look bad if we vote against it.

But the worst part about this bill is that it is a reckless attempt to curtail the President's power to wage a congressionally approved war.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply need to understand that this misguided proposal will serve only to hamstring our generals as they work to bring peace and democracy to this tumultuous region. And again my

colleague that has spoken before me, Congressman KLINE, I think has done a great job of talking about what the generals have said and what they need, and we know that the Democrats very selectively take quotes out of what General Petraeus has said.

And I agree with you, Congressman PRICE, we have both a military and a political war to win in the Middle East, and we are going to do that. I have every conviction that we are going to do that. But I think it is very interesting, as Congressman KLINE pointed out, that even the very liberal mainstream media understands that this slow-bleed strategy on the part of the Democrats is absolutely wrong. It is such a cynical thing that they are proposing to do. And I think that the L.A. Times editorial, "Do we Really Need a General Pelosi?" is so appropriate. These people promised so much to get elected last fall, and the kinds of things they are doing are so far away from what they promised to do. And getting involved in micromanaging the war is absolutely the opposite of what they should do.

I am going to quote some of what nobody else has quoted from the editorial. It went on to call the bill "an unruly mess, bad public policy, bad precedent, and bad politics . . . It was one thing for the House to pass a non-binding vote of disapproval. It's quite another for it to set out a detailed timetable with specific benchmarks and conditions for the continuation of the conflict."

And we saw this morning a replay of a press conference where even the Democrats couldn't agree on what the timetables are that they are setting up. They talk about 2007, they talk about August, they talk about April. Even they are very, very confused about it. But the L.A. Times article goes on to say: "This is the worst kind of congressional meddling in military strategy. If Congress accepts Bush's argument that there is still hope, then lawmakers have a duty to let the President try this 'surge and leverage' strategy."

"By interfering with the discretion of the Commander in Chief and military leaders in order to fulfill domestic political needs, Congress undermines whatever prospects remain of a successful outcome. It's absurd for House Speaker Nancy Pelosi to try to micromanage the conflict, and the evolution of Iraqi society, with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks."

I mean even when the liberal press comes out against you, you have got to know that something is wrong with what you are planning to do.

The Washington Post has described the Democrats' slow-bleed strategy as leading "not toward a responsible withdrawal from Iraq but to a constitutional power struggle with Mr. Bush, who has already said he will veto the legislation. Such a struggle would serve the interests of neither the Democrats nor the country."

I think these people are so detached, they are so focused on what they see as their power, one they think through an overwhelming majority, which was not an overwhelming majority in the fall, but they think that they now have all power. They don't want to just be Members of Congress. They want to be the President. And I think that it is ridiculous that they want to do that.

Like my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I want to see America's troops come home as soon as possible. But the best way to do that is to achieve victory in Iraq.

Somebody pointed out in the last few days that we never hear the word "victory" out of the mouths of any Democrat, and I started listening for that and I think the American people need to listen for that. The Democrats want us to lose in Iraq. They want to be able to prove that this was not a good war. I think for their own political purposes they would like to see us lose. They never mention victory.

If we don't secure Iraq before we leave, we will be encouraging the terrorists and insurgents by convincing them that their war of attrition has been successful.

I want to emphasize again what has been said before. There are very good reasons why our founders set up congressional oversight and accountability for presidential war powers, but micromanaging legitimate wars on the basis of political considerations was never one of them. This Congress needs to focus on our constitutional duty to provide long-term oversight. Not enough of that has been done. We need to do more of that. But to set a precedent of micromanaging a war is shortsighted and extremely dangerous. We need to get back to doing what Congress should be doing and leaving the execution of this war to the President and the generals who are there to do it, and let us do our job. We don't do well enough as it is.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her perspective and especially bringing to light the interesting articles that we are now seeing come out in the national press.

And the editorial that you and that Colonel KLINE brought to us today from the L.A. Times saying, "Do we Really Need a General Pelosi?" And the underheading of that was "Congress can cut funding for Iraq, but it shouldn't micromanage the war." And, in fact, that is what we would suggest, that if the majority party believes so strongly that we ought to end our involvement in Iraq, then let us have that vote. Let us have that debate, and let us have that vote. And if that is what they believe we ought to do, then we should have that vote. I would be interested to see what the outcome would be. I suspect that we are not having that vote because the majority leadership is afraid of the outcome of that vote because it doesn't fit with what they have been telling people and

with what they would like to see. So I think it is important that we do concentrate on what they are doing, and that is proposing to micromanage the war.

And if I am able to bring a few quotes from some other folks to talk about this slow-bleed micromanagement of the war plan, about a week ago it was quoted in one of the local newspapers that "House Democratic leaders said the measure, expected to put conditions on the President's use of funds . . ." And then quoting the Speaker on March 8, she said: "The House Democratic plan for the Iraq funding bill could force a pullout of U.S. combat troops starting on July 1, with all American units out of the country by the end of 2007."

And then another quote from the Associated Press on March 8: "Speaker Nancy Pelosi . . . told reporters the measure would mark the first time the new Democratic-controlled Congress has established a 'date uncertain' . . ."

□ 1545

That is micromanagement by anybody's definition. In fact, Representative Dan BOREN, a Democrat from Oklahoma, said, "It is still micromanaging the war." Goodness knows that is the last place this Congress needs to be is micromanaging the war. Again, that is why we have the principles of the system in place that we have, that it is the executive branch's responsibility to conduct a war, to conduct the defense of our Nation.

Again, if we in Congress believe that it is appropriate to cut off funding for that, then let's have that vote. Let's have that vote, Madam Speaker. I would welcome the opportunity to defend the action of our military currently and would welcome the opportunity to oppose that kind of vote. But I suspect the majority leadership in this House is not interested in having that vote. That would be a truthful and honest debate about what this Nation ought to do; and, frankly, we haven't seen that to date on this issue. But I encourage them to bring that forward.

I am pleased to be joined by my good friend and fellow Georgian, Congressman Lynn WESTMORELAND. Georgia has a strong history of relationship with our military and with our Defense Department, and Congressman WESTMORELAND represents a number of those areas. We welcome you and appreciate you joining us today and look forward to your perspective.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you, Congressman PRICE. Thank you for doing the Official Truth Squad. It is an honor to be here with Colonel Kline. Like he said, the number of our Vietnam veterans is declining every year, and we are fortunate enough to serve with some great heroes from that war in this body.

It is interesting that we have talked about micromanaging, we have talked

about different people taking on the role of general. Today in the Committee on Government Reform when we were passing out a bill that I feel is unconstitutional to give the D.C. Delegate the ability to vote and also creating another seat in Utah, I was reading the Constitution and I came across the part where it called the President the Commander in Chief. This is something that our Founding Fathers I think had experienced through the Revolutionary War and through the different militias and the different bands of people, that they understood that we needed one Commander in Chief. So they gave that responsibility to the man who is ultimately responsible for what goes on in this country, the guy that, as Harry Truman put it, the buck stops here. They gave the President the responsibility to be the Commander in Chief.

Now, we have several people in this body who I think want to be the Commander in Chief. In fact, I think we have got probably over 200 people that think they need to be the Commander in Chief. But the truth of it is our Constitution only gives that to one person.

What the Constitution also does is give Congress the ability to put forth funds for this war. If that is what the President decides to do, it gives Congress the ability to do that. It also gives them the ability to declare war.

This House voted and the Senate voted to authorize President Bush to use the military force that he has used, and if they don't like that, then they need to do something to call that authority back or to reauthorize or not to reauthorize. But we need to quit micromanaging and interfering with the affairs of our military leaders. General David Petraeus was approved unanimously in the Senate. Then the very next week they are trying to tell him how to run the war.

The other interesting thing is, and I think Ms. FOXX spoke about all the pork that is in this supplemental bill to fund the war, which, by the way, I think the President asked for about 3 or 4 weeks ago, so we want to make sure we do have these funds for our troops and not just keep prolonging it. But it would be good to hurry and bring this bill to the floor, since they have called it an emergency spending bill. But as Ms. FOXX pointed out, there are several things in there that really aren't what I would consider emergency spending.

One of the other things that has been taken out of that is the Iran language. I don't know if you had seen that or Colonel Kline or any of you had seen that, but they have taken the Iran language out of it.

I wanted to quote something, Congressman, because I think this is kind of what we are seeing out of the majority party, is they will say one thing about one situation and something counter to that on something else.

Here is what was said about the Iran situation: "I don't think it was a very

wise idea to take things off the table if you are trying to get people to modify their behavior and normalize it in a civilized way."

That was a quote from Representative Gary ACKERMAN, talking about that if we tied the hands of the President, that it would take away any threat off the table that he might have to use against Iran to make them follow the U.N. resolution or some of the things that we have asked them to do. I think that is very unusual, or at least concerning to me, that on the one hand they are tying the President's hands on what he is doing in Iraq, but they don't want to tie his hands on what he is doing in Iran.

Hopefully one day we will see some decisive leadership come out of this Congress. I think that the Republicans gave 12 good years of leadership, and I hope that the American people will miss that one day, as bad as we were at times. I hope that they will miss that and want to put us back in that position where we can earn our way back into the leadership of this country.

But I certainly hope that in the next year and a half that we don't do things that will ruin our reputation with freedom-loving people all over this world, that the American people don't keep their word.

Colonel Kline, I can't help but just think about that picture of that last helicopter leaving South Vietnam and those people standing on the top of that government building with their hands reached out, knowing that after our troops pulled out because of political pressure that some of those people were probably murdered and massacred the next day, or at least within the next 30 days.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield, we forget and time slips by that following that disastrous day, not some people were killed, but millions died. Again, we have forgotten the boats, the ships, with hundreds and thousands of Vietnamese scrambling to stay on board, leaky boats, rafts, as they tried to escape the horror that followed that day. A movie was made called "The Killing Fields" that depicted quite graphically the humanitarian disaster that followed that withdrawal.

I think that that scenario of a humanitarian disaster has been painted for us by a number of true experts in the field, even those who have been harshly critical of the administration's conduct of this war. The recognition that you could have that kind of bloodbath is widely seen, except perhaps by the House leadership, who has, as we said earlier, a plan for defeat in Iraq, which I am afraid would in fact lead to that kind of disaster.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, when we use the term "slow bleed," let's think about what that means. If you are going to torture your enemy or want somebody to have the most painful death possible, you give them a slow bleed. You let them bleed

out very slowly. You are a doctor and you know that can be the most painful death in the world.

That is what they are doing, is a slow bleed. It is going to be a painful death, not only for our military and for the victory we want to have in Iraq and Afghanistan, but for those people that the colonel is talking about. And those people have been our allies in this. Those are the people that believe with all their heart and mind and soul and every breath that they want to breathe freedom and liberty. Those are the people that believe in what we believe in, and they have pulled alongside of us to make this work. Those are the first ones that are going to be slaughtered.

So thanks for giving me the opportunity to come down and speak, and thanks for doing the Truth Squad. I just look forward to continuing this debate one day.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman's comments and your perspective on it. It is chilling. Slow bleed is chilling, because it is not just slow bleed for our allies. It is slow bleed for our troops and our military. You talk about the consequences of failure. This is a list of the consequences of failure. This doesn't come from the national Republican Party or the House Republican Caucus. This comes from the National Intelligence Estimate.

What it says clearly crystallizes what would happen if the majority party here enacts the slow bleed policy that is promoted by their leadership. It says: "Coalition capabilities, including force levels, resources and operations, remain an essential stabilizing element in Iraq. If we fail in Iraq, the Iraqi security forces would be subject to sectarian control, interference by neighboring countries in open conflict," which means Iran and others would pour into Iraq, "massive civilian casualties and population displacement."

That is what the colonel was talking about earlier happened after the conflict in Vietnam.

"Al Qaeda in Iraq would plan increased attacks inside and outside of Iraq and spiraling violence and political disarray, including Kurdish attempts at autonomy in Kirkuk."

But the spiraling violence is again the important thing to concentrate on, because that is not our conference, that is not our caucus saying that. That is the National Intelligence.

Colonel, if you would like to comment and make a few words, then I know we have Congressman DAVIS here.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding. That is exactly the point.

You had a chart up earlier that said something about you are entitled to your own opinion, but not your own facts. We seem to be very selective. We have heard a lot of very selective fact-choosing recently.

I remember in the debate we had on the floor of this body a couple of weeks

ago, there were people who said consistently that the President's troop surge was in violation of the recommendation of the Iraq Study Group. We know for a fact that is not true, that on page 73 the Iraq Study Group agreed that a surge would be appropriate if it was requested by the commander on the ground, and we have covered in this Special Order the fact that the commander on the ground, General David Petraeus, has in fact said that he needs those troops, and it will be for a temporary basis.

If I can take one more minute, because I know our colleagues have joined us and others want to speak on this critical issue, we do have some details of the Democrat supplemental so far that I have been looking at and trying to figure out. It is just a barrage of demands on the administration for reports and certifications which will make this unworkable for the Commander in Chief. It is in fact micro-management.

There is by July 1, 2007, the President has to report on a whole series of things. By October 1, 2007, he has to have another report verifying the report from July 1. In either case, if that doesn't satisfy the majority in the Congress, we have to start withdrawing troops within 180 days. If none of that applies and nothing else pertains by March 1, that is less than a year away, we have to begin deployment and redeployment. We have to leave; we have to retreat from Iraq within 180 days. This indeed details a plan for defeat.

I don't know yet exactly all it is going to say, but one of the things that is in this bill would require that no Federal funds could be used to send any military unit to Iraq "unless the chief of the military department concerned has certified in writing at least 15 days in advance as to the readiness of this unit." I don't know, but if you are in the 82nd Airborne, within 15 days you are already long since on the ground and in combat.

It is horrible micromanaging. As I said in my opening remarks joining you here on the floor, I agree with the L.A. Times, and I don't get to say that very often, so perhaps I should say it again: I agree with the L.A. Times that we don't need a General PELOSI or a General MURTHA, or for that matter a General PRICE or a General KLINE. We have a general on the ground, and we ought to be doing everything in our power to make sure that he and our young men and women have everything they need to succeed.

I know that all of us worry about our sons and daughters that we send over there, we as a body. I certainly worry. My son has been over and back and is planning to deploy again to Afghanistan. I worry about my son and about all sons and daughters. But I absolutely do not want to be part of sending our sons and daughters into conflict knowing that all we have is a plan for them to fail. That, in my mind, and I think in many of their minds, is a betrayal.

I had some of the \$21 billion of extra spending here, but I know that we have other colleagues that are joining us, and for that I thank you again for your leadership and yield back.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota again for his participation here and great perspective and for outlining truly what the majority party has done, and that is outlined their plan for failure. This is not a plan for victory. It is not even a plan for the defense of the United States. It is a plan for failure.

□ 1600

I think it is important that as we bring truth and light to this discussion and this debate that the American people appreciate that.

It is not by any grand fabrication that we come up with this Commander in Chief notion, it comes out of the Constitution of the United States. Article II, Section 2, for those who are interested in looking it up for themselves, says the President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of several States when called into actual service of the United States.

It doesn't say as long as the Speaker of the House says it is okay. It says that the President shall be the Commander in Chief. So if the majority leadership in this House wants to have a debate about whether or not we ought to fund the military challenges that we have around the world, including in Iraq, let us have that debate and let's have that vote. But let's not go through a micromanagement and a slow-bleed process which would be the death knell of our military accomplishments in the Middle East and in Iraq.

With that, I am pleased to have join us the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS). I welcome you and look forward to your comments.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Thank you, Congressman PRICE, for giving me an opportunity to join you today. And, Mr. KLINE, thank you for your leadership in the Congress and in the military. I appreciate it so very much.

Congressman PRICE, as you well know, none of us want to be in war; I certainly don't want to be in a war. But the fact is, we are in a war on terror. As a matter of fact, I think back right after September 11, 2001, the first casualty in Afghanistan was Sergeant Davis from my district. A distant family member, the first casualty in the war on terror after we decided that we were going to join the battle. As you well know, that battle didn't start on September 11. This is not a war just limited to Iraq. This war has been going on a long time. It is a global war on terror. This war has been going on for a long time, and it was started by radical Islamic extremists.

This war didn't start on September 11. It has been going on for a long time. Many of you can remember the Iranian

hostage crisis. In 1979, 52 Americans were held for 444 days until we had a President that finally came to office and said we are going to have a backbone and we are going to take on the terrorists, and those 52 Americans were set free.

Then we had the bombing of the Beirut barracks in 1983 where 241 Americans were killed.

Then we had the first bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993. So you are starting to see a trend here. This war really didn't start on September 11, and it is really not a war that is limited to Iraq.

Then we step forward in time to the year 2000, the bombing of the USS Cole. Seventeen sailors were killed.

Finally, September 11, 2001, almost 3,000 Americans were killed. How soon we forget.

I certainly haven't forgotten. I am sure that the family members of those 3,000 haven't forgotten, and I hope the American people and the Congress and the majority in the Congress never forget those 3,000 people that were killed.

We are going to be fighting this battle somewhere. We are in a war with a people that hate us; terrorists that hate us. They hate our freedoms; and, quite frankly, I think they hate our religion.

The extremists engaged us in battle. We owe it to our fellow citizens to see that we have nothing less than total victory. We can and we must win this war on terror. We simply cannot allow this Congress to move forward with a slow-bleed strategy. We must not cut off funding for our troops.

I spent several hours last week at Walter Reed Medical Center, and I had the opportunity to see men and women in uniform. Many of them had lost limbs. Many of them had internal injuries. We owe them nothing less than total victory. We asked them to go protect us. I can't imagine a Congress and a government of the United States not standing behind them to make sure that they also have victory.

America cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the past by withdrawing from a direct confrontation of the radical Islamic extremists. They will stop at nothing to destroy America. They have proved that.

You know, I can remember when people said they have fought over there, they have been fighting over there for thousands of years, why are we over there? The reason we are over there is because they came over here. They brought the war to us, and they have been bringing the war to us for well over 30 years. This is not something we can turn our backs on.

I have spoken to the men and women in uniform as they have returned, and I can tell you to a person, every one of them said we are doing the right things. We need to stay there. We need to finish this job.

Can you imagine being a soldier over there and knowing that the Congress has the potential to pass a law that we

could pull out in 18 months. Can you imagine being a soldier over there at 17 months, 3 weeks, 4 days, and you are on patrol and knowing you can lose your life or your limb, but in 3 days you are going to be pulled out and we are going to lose the war anyway. I can't imagine being a soldier that is being asked to do that. We need to have soldiers that understand that we are going to be there for them because they are there for us.

The consequences of failure in Iraq would be tragic for America and for the entire world. If we retreat, the enemy will follow. Our decisions now regarding how we handle this global war on terror will affect future generations. We have the duty to pursue nothing less than victory.

The good news is the surge is working. It is already taking place. For instance, Brian Williams, anchor of NBC News, hardly a news group that typically sides with Republicans, recently reported a dramatic change in Ramadi. The city is now safer, according to Mr. Williams.

It is already working. How can we be talking about cutting and running and failing on this critical issue?

We need to stop campaigning on the floor of the House, and we need to get about allowing the generals to be the military leaders.

As you pointed out just moments ago, there is one Commander in Chief, not 535. Congress should not micromanage this war, and we need to let our military leaders do just that, lead. That is what they are called to do.

General Petraeus just weeks ago received unanimous approval in the Senate, and a week later you have Senators and Congressmen and Congresswomen saying we don't want to listen to what he says. Actually what he is telling us to do is send in the troops.

It is almost like the cavalry. If you can remember growing up, the trumpet would sound, the bugle would alert, and you would bring in the troops to win the battle. We need to do that same thing.

What we have been doing over the last few years has actually worked again. The United States has been able to prevent further terrorist attacks on our homeland since 2001. We did it by taking the fight to them. They have proven they are going to fight us somewhere, it is either over there or over here. I would much rather keep them busy over there if they want to continue the fight.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may have the votes to defund the war, bring the troops home, and not use the word "retreat." But if we leave before the job is finished, we have retreated. It is simple. We either win this war or we lose this war.

The good people of the First District of Tennessee and I support the efforts of our troops and we support winning this global war on terror. We can do no less.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate so much your comments and your perspective on this because you bring light to some important information.

One is visiting the men and women at Walter Reed, and how moving is that experience every time we take part in that, and thank those young men and women for the work they have done in defense of our liberty and of our freedom.

If anyone wants moving accounts, all they have to do is read or listen to conversations or e-mails sent back from our men and women who are in harm's way right now. I get chills every time somebody forwards to me an account by one of our brave military men and women as they describe what is going on on the ground, and the enthusiasm and the passion that they have for the wonderful work that they are doing to bring freedom and liberty to that land.

You bring light to who our enemy is. I think it is important that we appreciate exactly the magnitude of this. This is a battle, a war against an enemy who is more ferocious than any we have ever faced.

When I try to put that in perspective, I am reminded of the airline debacle that was stopped last August or so in Britain by good intelligence on the part of our British allies and Pakistanis and our own intelligence agents. What they did is identify a group of individuals whose whole goal was to bring down or destroy as many jumbo jet airlines flying from England or Europe to the United States at one time so they could kill more innocent civilians than were killed on 9/11. That is chilling enough. That is enough to get your attention.

But when you appreciate that two of the people who were involved in the planning of that and involved in what would have been the execution of that tragedy were two parents who were using their 8-month-old child and the baby food for that child as the vessel for the explosive that would bring down a plane, and they were going to be on that plane with their 8-month-old child, they were going to kill themselves and their 8-month-old child in order to kill innocent civilians, Madam Speaker, that is an enemy that carries with them the ferocity that we cannot even comprehend. It is an enemy that Musab al-Zarqawi crystalizes in his quote of January 2005 when he says, "We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology."

Madam Speaker, it is extremely important for us as a nation to appreciate the fundamental objection and the fundamental fight that we have is against people who oppose our own freedom and our own liberty and our own democracy.

Madam Speaker, it is imperative that this Congress appreciate the magnitude of the challenge that we face as a nation. It is imperative that in so appreciating that magnitude, that we recognize that facts and truth are im-

portant when we talk about this and we make certain that we as a Congress do not institute a policy that would result in tying the hands of the men, the brave men and women in our military who are defending our liberty and our freedom and our democracy.

It is a privilege for each and every one of us to be able to represent our districts in the United States House of Representatives. We should do nothing to thwart the activity of those who are defending our liberty and our freedom and our democracy.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TAUSCHER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Again, it is a great privilege to address this House in the Special Order for the Blue Dog Democratic Coalition, and we are delighted to do so.

This is a very critical time in the juncture of our Nation. We are faced with a ballooning debt. We have an overextended military. We are in the midst of a very controversial war. It is paramount that Congress not just weigh in, but weigh in heavily as due our constitutional obligations.

As we all know, the Constitution speaks very clearly on this matter. In Article I, Section 8, it speaks very clearly that it is exclusively Congress' responsibility when it comes to military action and foreign policy.

□ 1615

And that is this: it says that only Congress has the exclusive right to determine the purse strings. In other words, the exact verbiage in the Constitution is "to raise and support the military." And then, secondly, to legislate. And quite naturally, it gave the executive branch comparative duties in a time of war.

You know, Madam Speaker, in preparation for this time on the floor, I went back into the Constitution because I wanted to examine how this came about. And if you go back in the Constitution around 1787, if I am not mistaken, there was a great debate on how to handle the question of war and foreign policy facing our Nation. And it was handled by two of our greatest Founding Fathers, one was Alexander Hamilton and the other was James Madison.

But you know, Madam Speaker, it was a peculiar circumstance that neither Hamilton nor Madison used their names. That struck me as very strange. Hamilton wrote under the name of Pacificus, and Madison wrote under the name of Helvidius. And I wondered about that. Why? But it was only on this profound question. Because it was so heavily debated, it was so heavily controversial that neither

party wanted the public to know exactly who was saying what. But it was very important that they agree on the substance to leave this issue very flexible.

But the one important point that they made was it would be the Congress, and expressly the House of Representatives of the Congress, that would have the final say so on the money end and on the legislative end, and that is what we are here to do today. For the American people are looking to this Congress to indeed weigh in. And Hamilton and Madison will smile kindly on us today.

Leading off our discussion, Madam Speaker, is one of our distinguished Members, one of our cochairs for communications, one of my dear friends from the great State of Arkansas, Representative MIKE ROSS.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for leading this hour-long Special Order, this discussion on the debt, the deficit, but more importantly on accountability, in restoring common sense, accountability, fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

Madam Speaker, I don't have to tell you that we have got the largest debt ever in our Nation's history; \$8,835,629,777,913 and increasing some \$40 million every hour. Our Nation is spending a half a billion dollars a day simply paying interest on a debt we've already got, and that is before we increase it by \$1 billion a day. Half a billion dollars a day going to pay interest on the national debt. That is a half a billion dollars a day we do not have to properly equip our troops, to support our troops, to support our veterans, those returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, to educate our children, to build roads. The list of what should be America's priorities is endless, and yet our Nation is spending half a billion dollars a day simply paying interest on a debt we've already got.

It is time to restore fiscal discipline and common sense to our government, and one of the ways we do that is by requiring accountability in Iraq. That is why the Blue Dogs have written what has become known as H.R. 47, providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability.

Let me just say this, that 9/11, September 11, 2001, is a day that I will never forget. From my office window in the Cannon House Office Building I could see the smoke rise from the Pentagon. A few hours later, after being evacuated, I would learn that a young Navy petty officer, Nehamon Lyons, IV, from Pine Bluff, Arkansas, was among those killed at the Pentagon on that dreadful day.

In the months that followed, I voted to give the President the authority to go to Afghanistan to hunt down Osama bin Laden. Remember him? To bring him to justice and to put an end to the Taliban, to put an end to terrorism. And then on September 26, 2002, I was called to the White House. I sat in the Cabinet Room, took notes, I still have

them, where the President and Andy Card and Condoleezza Rice and about 20 Members of Congress present proceeded to tell us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, that Saddam Hussein trains terrorists on weapons of mass destruction, and that if military force is used, in the President's word, it will be, quoting now, "swift." September 26, 2002.

Fast forward to March 13, 2007. More than 3,000 brave men and women in uniform have died, have sacrificed with their lives in Iraq. Thousands more injured in ways that will forever change their lives. As long as we have men and women in uniform in harm's way, I am going to support them; members of the Blue Dog Coalition are going to support them.

This war has affected all of us. My brother-in-law is presently stationed in the United States Air Force in the Middle East. My first cousin was in Iraq when his wife gave birth to their first child. People that I grew up with and taught in Sunday school and duck hunt with have already served one tour through the Arkansas National Guard duty in Iraq and will likely be returning next year if the President gets his way with this so-called surge.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the American people spoke on November 7, and they told us they do not want more of the same. And simply adding 20,000 more troops to Iraq is, in my opinion, more of the same. The American people want a new direction in Iraq, not more of the same. In line with that, the American people want accountability for how their tax money is spent, not only in Iraq, but also here at home. And that is what we are trying to do with House Resolution 97.

Government investigations and media reports have detailed waste, fraud, and possible war profiteering by some of the very contractors that are being paid billions of dollars by the United States for their services in Iraq. Most recently, a report issued January 30 by the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction counts unsanitary conditions, potential health hazards, poor construction methods, and significant cost overruns among the examples of waste, fraud and abuse rampant in the government's funding of the Iraq war.

House Resolution 97, which has been written and endorsed by the 43-member strong fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, puts forth tangible commonsense proposals that ensure future transparency and accountability in the funding of Operation Iraqi Freedom. House Resolution 97 is an important first step toward making sure that more resources get to our troops in the field.

House Resolution 97 focuses on four crucial points for demanding fiscal responsibility in Iraq: a call for transparency on how Iraq war funds are spent; the creation of a Truman Commission to investigate the awarding of contracts; a need to fund the Iraq war

through the normal appropriations process and not through these so-called emergency supplementals; and, finally, using America's resources to approve Iraqi assumption of internal policing operations.

Funding requests for the Iraq war should come through the normal appropriations process so that Congress and the people have a clear understanding about what is being spent on the war in Iraq. With House Resolution 97, the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition is calling for the Iraqi Government and its people to progress toward full responsibility for internally policing their country. Without such progress, it is wasteful to continue our investment in the lives, limbs, and taxpayer dollars in Iraq.

We must honor those who have sacrificed in Iraq, our brave men and women in uniform, and the thousands more that have come home injured in ways that will forever change their lives. It is very important that we honor them, we support them and their sacrifices through demanding accountability from the Iraqi people. It is time to tell the Iraqi people it is time to step up and accept more responsibility for your own country. If you are going to continue to shoot at one another and to shoot at us, if public opinion poll after public opinion poll coming out of Iraq says that 70 percent of them don't want us there and 60 percent of them think it is okay to kill a U.S. soldier there, then we should send a clear message to the Iraqi people that it is time for them to step up and assume responsibility. If they want us to continue to sacrifice our brave men and women in uniform and return many more thousands home injured, if they want us to continue to spend \$12 million an hour of our tax money in Iraq, some \$2.5 billion a week, then it is time for the Iraqi people to accept more responsibility and more accountability for their actions.

At the same time, Madam Speaker, it is very important that this administration understand that if we are going to support \$12 million an hour, \$2.5 billion a week of hard-earned taxpayer money going to Iraq, we want to know how it is being spent, we want it accounted for, and we want to know without a shadow of a doubt that it is going to support our brave men and women in uniform.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. You hit upon a point here that the American people need to be aware of as to exactly why we need to pass our bill. I have before me what I would like to share with you, this report from today's Washington Post. It is a story by Ms. Ann Scott Tyson. It is a disheartening story, but it points right to the core of why we need to be doing something very urgent to bring accountability and the total lack of accountability that this administration has had. And this is about our veterans, those who are right off the battlefield.

And, Mr. ROSS, just like you, we both just came from Germany where we went into Landstuhl and we went into the military hospital near the Ramstein Air Base. And our hearts were broken as we saw 19- and 18- and 20-year-old kids, these are young kids, folks, who are out there at the point of the spear, sacrificing their lives in the middle of a civil war. And when they come back to get treated, here is the report. She says: "Thousands of soldiers wounded in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have overwhelmed the Army system for evaluating their eligibility for disability benefits, leading to a near total failure to complete such reviews in a timely manner."

And this is what the services Inspector General concluded in a report released yesterday. The report found this, Mr. ROSS, it found that medical hold facilities lack critical staff, formalized training for personnel caring for wounded soldiers, with more than half of unit commanders reporting inadequate, our commanders on the ground are reporting inadequate for our soldiers. This is no way to treat our warriors.

It also cited inadequate and unreliable databases for tracking the wounded, not even able to keep track of them. This is why we need our accountability act. This is why we need to have oversight and strong oversight on this administration. We are not talking about something here that doesn't exist. This is a serious problem that goes at the core and the soul of America, and that is our young men and women. Their lives are too precious, their blood is too precious to be sacrificed. Then when they do the sacrifice, they are not taken care of.

Just listen to this: some facilities lack wheelchair access, which is directly in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, is going on right now under this administration.

□ 1630

That meant that wounded soldiers even had difficulty reaching the restroom. This is the same administration, my friends, this is no wonder why we have this. If you recall, they were sent into war without body armor. Our soldiers, 2 years ago, were going through dung heaps and land mines out in the desert trying to find metal to protect themselves.

I said to you, and you and I both agreed when we were over there in Germany, we were going to do everything we could when we got back here to make sure we passed this bill and give the proper attention to our wounded and our veterans.

You know, the Lord moves in strange and mysterious ways, and I am convinced that is why the exposure of that terrible situation at Walter Reed was made real at this very time to show the Congress and the American people we need this accountability law.

Mr. ROSS. Let me just say there are those in this Congress that do not support sending \$12 million an hour to

Iraq, then you are unpatriotic. I differ with that. I strongly differ with it. No one needs to question my patriotism, no one needs to question my support for our men and women in uniform.

If you ask me, giving them more of the same is not showing support for our men and women in uniform. They need a new direction. They need a new direction in Iraq, one that will allow them to do their job and come back home to their families. The President proposing a surge of some 21,000 troops is not a new direction, it is more of the same.

At the same time, Madam Speaker, let me tell you that the other thing that the American people want is they want responsibility. They want responsibility by the Iraqi government. They want them to buy into this.

The other thing the American people want is accountability within our own government, which is clearly why we are advocating the passage of the Iraqi War Accountability Act, H.R. 97. Why is it needed? Because auditors in one region found that contract managers could not account for \$97 million disbursed from the development fund for Iraq. Under its no-bid contract to rebuild Iraq's oil infrastructure contract, Halliburton overcharged by over 600 percent for the delivery of fuel from Kuwait.

An audit of programs designed to train guards designed to protect Iraq's oil and electrical infrastructure concluded that U.S. agencies could not provide reasonable assurance that \$147 million expended under these programs was used for its intended purpose.

In one case, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction found that a company which was awarded a security management contract worth hundreds of millions of dollars could provide no assurance that it was providing the best possible safety for government and reconstruction personnel as required by the contract, and could not even show that its employees authorized to carry weapons were trained to use those weapons.

Finally, Halliburton tripled the cost of hand towels at taxpayer expense by insisting on having its own embroidered logo on each towel. You can't make this stuff up. Halliburton employees dumped 50,000 pounds of nails in the desert because they ordered the wrong size all at taxpayers' expense. This is not supporting our troops.

We want to fund our troops. We want to support our troops, and the way to do that is by requiring more accountability by this administration and the Pentagon. Quite frankly, for the last 6 years, Congress has not fulfilled its constitutionally given duty of providing oversight. It has been a rubber stamp for whatever this administration wants.

Those days are over, the new Congress has arrived, and we are going to begin to provide that oversight and accountability and demand responsibility, not only from this administration, but from the Iraqis through the passage of H.R. 97.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. You mentioned Halliburton, and there is no greater poster child for the abuse, for the very need for this legislation. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been wasted. The reports have been there, in the news. They have covered it left and right, and, meanwhile, our soldiers don't even have wheelchair access.

This administration has a day of atonement on this, and history is not going to smile kindly on the abuse that was heaped upon our military and the strain and the drain that it is causing. You mentioned earlier, Mr. ROSS, about Halliburton, and in just yesterday's news Halliburton's reward to us for all of the billions of dollars that they have gotten in taxpayers' money was to move their headquarters from the United States over into Dubai in the Middle East so that they could get out from under paying certain levels of taxes in this country.

No wonder the American people are crying out. No wonder the American people went to the polls in November and declared in a loud voice, enough of this, we want change, and they put Democrats in charge of this Congress. They, indeed, as I said earlier in my remarks, wanted Alexander Hamilton and James Madison to smile kindly, because finally we are standing up and performing the constitutional duties of oversight, of legislation and controlling the purse that they fought hard to put into the Constitution over two centuries ago.

Now I would like to yield time to my distinguished friend from Ohio, from Steubenville, Ohio, the home of one of my most favorite singers, Dean Martin, and I would like to present Representative CHARLIE WILSON.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I appreciate this opportunity.

Madam Speaker, when we sent cash over to Iraq on a pallet with no accountability, no understanding, and those hundreds of millions of dollars just disappeared into the desert air, we know that we need accountability. We need accountability in this war for the financial money that we have sent there. We also need accountability for the body armor and the proper rest for our soldiers, the proper training for our soldiers. We need to be able to show that we are showing accountability.

I am so proud to be a new Member of this Congress that is willing to stand up for our soldiers and for the right things to do for America. When more than \$400 billion have been poured into Iraq with little oversight on how that money is spent, we have to ask ourselves, we can't wait any longer for the accountability that needs to be done.

I am proud to be a member of the Blue Dog Coalition to be able to stand up and say what the national debt is. If we could see the money that we spend every month, and month after month and year after year on the interest debt of our Nation, almost \$9 trillion now, it is just hard to believe that we can con-

tinue down this lane of not making the proper decisions and not having accountability.

House Resolution 97 goes straight to the heart of the matter. It sets up the issue and the framework of how we are going to consider having the proper accountability so that we can know where we are going, where the money is going. These are hard-earned tax dollars, and many of these dollars are being spent that are not being spent on education and are not being spent on health care for our seniors.

These dollars are being funneled into foreign countries that were borrowing money to help pay this debt. It is not the right direction.

House Resolution 97 does call for regular reports to the Congress that outline how military and reconstruction funds are spent from now on. It also says the accounts for the terms and contracts that are awarded by our government, how long are the contracts? What is the accountability of them? Are they all no-bid contracts, and, if so, how long are they in place for?

We need to have that kind of accountability, and House Resolution 97 does that. It details how future taxpayer money will be spent. That is the kind of accountability that we need. The costs just keep climbing in Iraq, and we must get a true handle to know where these costs are.

The American taxpayer deserves to know the truth. They deserve to know what is going on, and this is what House Resolution 97 does. It shines the light of day on the process that is going on in Iraq. I am hopeful, if we can lean forward and move forward on this legislation, we will be able to have accountability that people will feel that we are doing the right things.

Our soldiers will know that they are having the right kind of support, and we, as Members of Congress, are providing the service and the change in direction to get America back on the right track.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield for one moment, and don't you agree, there is such a thirst on the part of the American people for their confidence to be restored in this process, that was what was evident in last fall's election, that nobody is saying cut and run, nobody is saying that you will be unpatriotic if you speak to this. They want us to speak to this. They want us to do our job, and I think that is what you were pointing out in your remarks.

One of the two points I wanted to mention too that you alluded to in our House Resolution 97, that I would like for you to be able to expand upon, and that is that the American people need to know that in this bill we will require the inspector generals of the Defense Department, of the Pentagon, to come before this Congress quarterly, not once a year, every 90 days, quarterly, to make reports on how the money is being spent.

Never again, never again, will our veterans be suffering in the condition

that our veterans are suffering now. The American people are appalled at that. They want some transparency. They want some accountability.

You talked about earlier, we talked about Halliburton. We talked about the abuse, the contracting. In this bill, we have made sure that the Inspector General for the Iraqi Reconstruction Program comes before this Congress and gives quarterly reports on how that money is being spent, no more waste, no more fraud, no more war profiteering. The shame of the neglect of oversight is going to be rectified with this bill.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Thank you to the gentleman from Georgia. You could not be more right, and it is evident in what we have seen in the Walter Reed Hospital situation we have just seen recently. The conditions are deplorable, to think that our men and women and our soldiers go and put their life on the line, and just thousands and thousands have been injured and they have returned to substandard medical care, poor conditions and sometimes horror stories of people waiting 18 hours to be seen by a doctor.

This type of lack of accountability just cannot continue, and I am proud to be a Member of this Congress and this Democratic Caucus that are going to move forward toward doing the right thing for our soldiers, supporting them with the money that they need and moving forward to bring common sense to this entire situation.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Congressman WILSON. Your comments and your participation is so meaningful in helping us bring some light to this issue, especially in extrapolating and explaining to the American people the legislation that we are putting forward. I look forward to you staying with us as we perhaps get into a few more conversations on this issue.

But we are also joined with another Member, a distinguished member of our Blue Dog Coalition and a very good friend and who is a very, very significant voice in this Congress in bringing some truth and some transparency so that we can improve the position of our military and make sure that we are responsive to the American people, and that is Mr. John Salazar from Colorado, a very distinguished Member and a hard-working member of the Blue Dog Coalition and a great friend.

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado as much time as he may need.

Mr. SALAZAR. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Madam Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues of the Blue Dog Coalition to demand more fiscal accountability in Iraq. You know, the Blue Dogs have a plan for fiscal accountability in Iraq. Our plan calls for four things, it calls for transparency on how the war funds are being spent.

Two, it creates an commission to investigate the awarding of contracts.

Three, it stops the use of supplemental supplementals to fund this war. Do you know that this is the first administration that has continually been using supplementals to fund a war? That is strange.

Number four, it uses American resources to improve Iraq's ability to police themselves.

Mr. SCOTT, I have been calling, on and on again, that it is important for us to turn the responsibilities over to the Iraqi people, let them be responsible for their own futures. Why should we be putting our soldiers lives on the line when over 60 percent of the Iraqis now claim that it is okay to shoot an American soldier?

But this is about accountability. This is about spending the American taxpayers' funds wisely. This is about the board of directors that America has selected and appointed to the U.S. Congress to do oversight on the taxpayers' funds that are being utilized to fund this war.

While the Blue Dog coalition legislation addresses the glaring lack of oversight and accountability in Iraq, we make sure that taxpayer dollars are accounted for. Government reports have documented waste, fraud and abuse in Iraq, time and time again.

□ 1645

I believe, Madam Speaker, that it is time now to stop that waste. Congressional oversight is desperately needed. The administration must be held accountable for how these reconstruction funds are being used.

And speaking about reconstruction funds, Mr. SCOTT, you mentioned just briefly about Halliburton. Well, I find it kind of strange that, you know, when they are needed most to help pay taxes so that we can actually fund this war, all of a sudden they decide to pull up stakes and move because they say their tax rates are too high. Well, to me, Mr. SCOTT, that is not being patriotic.

This Blue Dog bill is tangible. It is a commonsense proposal that ensures transparency and accountability. We have already spent \$437 billion in Iraq, according to the Congressional Research Service. We will spend another \$100 billion in Iraq in 2007 alone. I think that we must start showing improvement in Iraq, and accountability leads directly to success.

You brought up a real point. It is almost as if someone reaches into your chest and jerks out your heart. I make regularly scheduled visits out to Walter Reed to visit our returning troops, and I meet with them and talk to them.

Their message is quite simple. They are there to do their job. They are proud to be Americans. They are proud patriotic citizens and proud to have served their country. And they tell me, do not let our efforts go in vain.

Well, I can assure you, Mr. SCOTT, that the Blue Dogs are committed to making sure that we stand by them

and make sure that they have the equipment they need by holding this administration accountable.

It is amazing when you see our soldiers returning without arms and without legs and yet so strong and patriotic and talking about how proud they are to be Americans.

Well, Mr. SCOTT, it is time for the U.S. Congress to also say that they are patriotic and that they are proud Americans, and that they will stand by their soldiers. I think that Iraq must be progressing toward full responsibility for policing their own country. I think without progress it is a waste to continue U.S. investment in troops and financial resources. We all support our troops. We will do everything in our power to get them the equipment they need.

I have been in Iraq twice. The first time I was there, soldiers were complaining because they were out in the scrap piles looking for metal to build shields under the Humvees. And in many cases, those became the very instruments that cost their lives.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield just for one point because I think it is very important. You bring up this important point that we need to remind the people of America that when that came to our attention, it was Democrats, Democrats who provided the leadership with the amendment to put into the spending bill money for the body armor; that we could have known about the shortage if there was oversight, if that Congress, the Republican Congress, would not just automatically just bend over and rubber stamp. That is why this bill is so important, that we don't have that bypassing with this special emergency supplemental way of funding a war.

And I go back to the Constitution, the Founding Fathers, and that is why they gave it to us because the House of Representatives is the House that is closest to the people. We were more sensitive, just as you and I are now, to do everything we can to correct this matter. And we also put in there money to reimburse their parents. So many of our soldiers were writing home to mama and to daddy asking them for money for body armor. The shame of this country. Never again will that happen. And that is why we need this bill.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. SALAZAR. I want to thank the gentleman. And he made some very important points. It is our responsibility here in Congress to look out for our troops and our soldiers. But we cannot continue writing these blank checks, Madam Speaker. We have been writing blank checks for the last several years because over the last 6 years there hasn't been any oversight. There has not been any accountability.

And I can assure you that since January, over the last 2 months, there has been oversight hearings on several issues in regard to the military readiness, in regard to where some of this funding is going.

And so I am very proud to be a Member of the Blue Dog Coalition that brings forward this important bill. I think that until our last troop has returned home that the American people deserve to know how their money is being spent. Accountability is not only patriotic, but it often determines success from failure.

The Blue Dog bill gives an opportunity to regain oversight and responsibility. This is the responsibility we have, to all our men and women in uniform, to their parents, to the American taxpayer who is footing the bill.

Madam Speaker, today I want to thank you. I want to thank Mr. SCOTT for his leadership, and I want to thank you for giving me the time to be able to speak out on behalf of the American taxpayer, the American people and our soldiers in uniform.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well, thank you, Mr. SALAZAR. You have done extraordinarily well in presenting the very crucible of our bill, which is bringing the accountability, bringing the needed transparency. No more, no place is it needed more so than in the care of our wounded soldiers.

And so much has fallen through the cracks. I read this report. I just want to, I will go back to it for a moment, Mr. SALAZAR, because it says this. It says that more than 25,000 service members have been wounded in the two wars, and nearly half seriously enough that they can not return to duty within 72 hours. The delays in the Army's rating of disability have been a source of deep frustration for many, with wounded soldiers waiting hours to be moved on, days, and sometimes months to be moved on with their lives outside the military. Many in the National Guard themselves have lost their jobs. We have yet to even come to the depths of the pain that our soldiers are faced with as a result of this.

So when the President says send 21,000 more in, send these in, he never again, this President will never again have to go before the voters. But you do and I do. And when we go back before them, they will know that we have done everything in our power to bring a right look on a wrong situation, and to correct this terrible, terrible imbalance for our veterans.

And so I thank you for your participation, and I thank you for highlighting that great need. I appreciate your passion for this. We are very, very, pleased for your presentation.

Madam Speaker, before I bring in another person, I want to make a point, because I think it is very important that we take a moment to address what the leadership of the Democratic Party in this House of Representatives is really talking about in our legislation. We had, prior to this, a truth squad, and you have people who are trying to make it this or make it that.

We realize, as Democrats, that we have an obligation to fulfill the desires and the wishes of the American people for a change in direction in Iraq,

among other places, but definitely in Iraq. And it is not an easy thing to do. But it is, as I pointed out earlier, in our exclusive power to legislate and to appropriate and to provide the oversight. That is critical. And this is what we are proposing in our troop readiness, veterans, health, and Iraq accountability act. This is what the talk is about.

Let me just, point by point, go through the points so we understand. As the war in Iraq enters its fifth year, with no end in sight, that is fundamentally the most worrisome thing on the minds of the American people. This has gone on longer than World War II. There has never been the clear mission, beyond go and find if they have got weapons of mass destruction. When the soldiers went and they determined that they didn't, that should have ended it. There was no authorization to go in and remove a regime. There were no Iraqis that marched on the Capitol in Washington and said bring us a democracy. Democracy is hard. It requires people to want it in their gut. We are dealing with a society and a region in the Middle East where these civil wars have been going on, in some shape or form, since Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Abraham and Sarah and Hagar, Ishmael, Esau, the prophet Mohammed and his son-in-law, which brought about the split of the Sunnis and the Shias. Thousands of years, that is what this is.

Our children have no business losing their lives in this war. The President has asked that money continue to be provided with no strings attached. The American people want some strings attached. The reason is because as we just got through doing, with what is happening at Walter Reed, with what is happening to our veterans, with the fact of no body armor. We are not going without being rested and properly equipped, well after the American people have called for a new direction. That set the stage for what we are going to offer in this bill.

And I want to come back to that, and I want to pause for a moment because we do have another one of our distinguished Members with us, and he has been working very hard as a member of the Blue Dogs and has also been working very hard in this area of bringing transparency and accountability to the situation in Iraq and responding to the needs of the American people. And I want to recognize for as much time as he may need, Congressman MAHONEY of Florida.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. I thank my friend, the distinguished gentleman, for yielding time to me this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Florida's 16th Congressional District in support of House Resolution 97, providing cost accountability for the Iraq war.

If we take a look at what has happened over these past 5 years, America has rid Iraq of a brutal dictator. Amer-

ica has given the Iraqi people a chance to create their own democracy, and we have invested over \$400 billion and more than 3,000 American lives in securing their country.

Madam Speaker, it is time for the Iraqis to step up and to take control of their destiny and their own security. And it is imperative that any future American financial expenditures in the Iraq war be subject to accountability and transparency.

An estimated \$9 billion of Iraqi reconstruction funds are missing. According to a January 2005 report by the Office of the Special Inspector General of Iraq Reconstruction, these \$9 billion have gone missing because of inefficiencies and bad management.

□ 1700

For the past 4 years, Congress has not exercised the oversight and accountability necessary to ensure that our money is being used effectively to support our troops to achieve our objectives in Iraq. We have paid billions of dollars to private contractors for work in Iraq; at the same time, the reports have uncovered waste, fraud, abuse, and even possible war profiteering by some of these contractors.

In a war already lacking manpower, resources, and international support needed to maximize our chance of success, it is criminal that billions of dollars are unaccounted for. Congressional oversight is needed to make sure that our money is used to support our troops, not lost to profiteering and fraud.

House Resolution 97 would require that future Iraq spending is marked by transparency and accountability, instead of systemic waste, fraud, and abuse. The resolution calls for the creation of a Truman Commission to investigate how contracts are awarded, increases transparency so we know how Iraq war funds are spent, demands that fiscal requests for fiscal year 2008 and later go through the normal appropriations process instead of emergency supplementals, and calls for resources to be used to improve Iraqi assumption of policing operations.

Madam Speaker, these criteria are long overdue. I encourage my colleagues to support House Resolution 97 to ensure that transparency and accountability are the hallmarks of any future funding of the Iraq war.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I thank Congressman MAHONEY. You brought some excellent points up about the need for us to make sure that this funding goes through the normal appropriations process. It might be useful for us to just share with our American people, when we say the normal, the regular appropriations process, is that this President has up to this point funded this war, which has lasted now longer than World War II, on emergency supplementals. And what that does is it foregoes oversight, it doesn't allow Congress to do the job that it has done. And this is why I believe in strong

measure this Congress has changed hands. The American people want to see us do our job and bring about the transparency. And that is what is involved in both House Resolution 97 as well as in our leadership bill on the supplemental, the full supplemental bill that we are working on as well. And I certainly thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time. I couldn't agree more. And one of the things that the American people are starting to see is that this Democratic led Congress is about doing the people's business. November 7 was a mandate on fiscal responsibility reform. As a freshman Congressman, I ran on fiscal reform and responsibility, and I can tell you that this is a good step, another step, a necessary step to getting accountability back into this government. Thank you very much.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. We are very pleased to have you, and we certainly thank you for bringing those points and for adding to the discussion.

As I stated before, I wanted to just share as we go through this, as we talk about House Resolution 97 and our bill on the supplemental, it is important to understand so that we are not caught up in all of this rhetoric and misinformation about what the Democrats are doing, it is very important to understand our shared principles in this legislation and fully funding our national defense. This bill fully funds and supports our troops in both Iraq and Afghanistan, and we are upholding these points, requiring the President to simply honor the standards the Department of Defense has set for troop readiness, for training, for equipment. We have just seen that many of our troops have gone into harm's way without the body equipment that they need. What is wrong with making sure that our troops are protected, that they have the body armor? That is what the Democratic plan does. What is wrong with making sure that they are rested and that they are ready? That is what the Democratic plan does. We want to send our young men into harm's way? Make sure they are protected, make sure they are ready and that they are rested, and to make sure that they have been trained. And on each one of those counts, Madam Speaker, this administration has fallen short, and the American people know it, and that is the central core of the bill.

Secondly, we have got to hold the Iraqi government to the same standards for progress that the President outlined in announcing the escalation. The President made certain standards. All we are doing is reaffirming these in the legislation so that we have those standards. And then, providing urgently needed support to address the military medical care crisis for our veterans at Walter Reed and other hospitals. And that is why the American people are out in front of us and support wholeheartedly what the Democratic proposal is.

Let me continue, if I may, on what it is that we are doing so the American people can be clear.

On those three points, just simply requiring the President to honor the standards that the Defense Department sets for their military to be ready, that they have rest, that they have equipment. What can be more plain and commonsense than that? And then holding the Iraqis to the same standards that he put forward in support of the escalation he asked for. And then, thirdly, to provide the urgently needed support to address the military medical care and crisis at Walter Reed and other hospitals that I just got through alluding to and the excellent report in the Washington Post today.

The need for accountability on Iraq is clear. Holding the President to his own military readiness policies and performance standards is certainly a good way to start. The alternative is only the President's open-ended commitment in this war, and that is one thing we cannot continue. Our children's lives are too precious, our tax dollars are too precious to continue to be pouring in an open-ended policy. We have got to find a way to bring this matter to conclusion, not in any kind of way of, as the opponents would say, my friends on the other side of the aisle, cut and run. That is all they can say. We want to be there until victory.

Well, what is victory? What is victory if it is not what we set out what we were to do in the very beginning, finds weapons of mass destruction, which we did, and they are no longer there? Iraq did not attack this country. This country was attacked by al Qaeda. And al Qaeda is in Afghanistan on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. Osama bin Laden is there on the Pakistan side. I was there. I went over to Pakistan, I went over to Afghanistan. I talked with President Karzai. They know where they are. What are we doing in Iraq, and why did we go?

The Congress is working hard to achieve consensus around these shared principles. And let me just say, politics is no easy business. Making laws is sort of making sausage: It is not the prettiest thing in the world. But it is our system. It is give and it is take. It is trying to get 218 votes. It is pulling coalitions together. And that is why you see legislation with the variety of different components in it. But there are some standards here, and we hope that the President will join us in the effort to protect our troops in the field, require accountability from the Iraqi government, and fix the care crisis for our wounded soldiers and our veterans. And, finally, understand that he isn't the only one on the ball field. We all have a role to play. The Founding Fathers made our position clear, and that clarity is speaking on this floor today.

And now I want to recognize another one of the distinguished Members from New Hampshire (Ms. PORTER) who is doing just a wonderful job, and we thank you for coming on the floor and

being a part of our debate and discussion.

I yield as much time as she may need to Ms. PORTER from New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I thank the gentleman, and Madam Speaker.

I just came out of an Armed Services hearing where we were discussing, once again, readiness, and we had the Army there telling us the great strains on their budget, the strains on their equipment, and, most importantly, the strains on their soldiers. And so I am standing here today in support of our soldiers, in support of our military, in support of our ability to respond to any crisis in the world. And Iraq is not the place that we need to put our soldiers and all of our resources.

Last weekend, I went to Iraq to look for myself what was going on. I saw a lot of contractors taking quite a bit of money, serving soldiers in jobs that soldiers could have done themselves. I saw the strains on the soldiers. I saw National Guard troops that were in for a third deployment. And I saw the difficulty that the Iraqis were experiencing. In flying over Baghdad, I saw a very sad city.

Now, what I would like to see happen is for us to take the money that we are pouring into Iraq and put it into Afghanistan where the original trouble started, where we actually had the terrorist training camps, where we still need to finish the business that we started in 2001. But we need money to do that, we need resources to do that. They have been diverted and put into Iraq.

There were no Iraqis on the planes that day on 9/11. We went into Iraq because we picked the wrong war, the wrong people, and we should have stayed in Afghanistan and supported the effort there. So I urge my colleagues and I urge the House to do the right thing by our soldiers and by the Iraqis as well, and to make sure that we tend to where the real problems are in Pakistan and also in Afghanistan.

I also would like to see some money in homeland security. The first thing we need to do is support our own borders. We need to protect our borders. And when you look at the money that we have put in homeland security, it is miniscule. We are still not checking all of the cargo that comes into the belly of a plane, we are not checking the cargo that comes from overseas. They say that we don't have the equipment. We certainly could have the equipment. Hong Kong checks every single container that comes from abroad. And that is the great worry, that a dirty bomb could come from abroad in a container. We need to use the money wisely. Of course we need defense. We have to invest in our country. But we need to take those dollars and make sure that we are protecting our borders first and foremost, and then also working in Afghanistan; and, making sure that we have enough money and enough resources and enough troops to respond to anywhere else in the world that trouble could brew. Thank you.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well stated. Eloquent and very well stated. And you touched on so many important issues. The strain on our military; and the young lady was so poignant in that. And American people need to understand that, how much more can our military take? Every person, even when the issue was put forward when General Casey and General Abizaid came over here, our Armed Services Committee, I think you may have been on that committee, asked them: Do you need more troops? No, we don't need any more troops. That was just in November. And something changed just in about 30 or 50 days, for all of a sudden now it came.

And I want to thank the young lady for your statement. It was very well stated and hit all of the points right on the head in terms of the direction we need to go. And the American people are definitely in step with us.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for the time. Please remember this is our Blue Dog hour, and we appreciate the opportunity to talk.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 106

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to talk about embryonic stem cells. With all of the pressing issues of global importance that our country and the Congress is dealing with, you might ask, why are you going the talk about embryonic stem cells this evening; why are you not talking about the potential for global warming and what that might hold in store for our world.

□ 1715

We might be talking about the pending energy crisis and the concept of peak oil, and certainly we might be talking about the war in Iraq and the funding resolution that will shortly come before the House. Or we could be talking about a very interesting subject: the debt limit ceiling and why we have to increase the debt limit ceiling and what is that and how does it relate to the debt and the deficit and so forth?

We come to the floor this evening to talk about stem cells because a stem cell bill will very shortly come up in

the Senate, perhaps even this week. Very probably if not this week, next week. But to put this in context, we have got to go back to last year when there were two embryonic stem cell bills that came before the House and the Senate. One of those started in the House and was known as the Castle-DeGette bill. This was a bill that would permit Federal funding for cells taken from embryos that were surplus in the fertility clinics across the country, and I understand there may be as many as 400,000 surplus embryos that are now frozen in these fertility clinics. This would result in the death of the embryo, and a meaningful percentage of our population does not believe that it is appropriate to destroy one life in the hopes that you might help another. So although this bill got a positive vote in the House last year, it was nowhere near enough to override a presidential veto.

There was a second bill that was introduced. I introduced that second bill along with my friend Dr. GINGREY, and that bill garnered 273 votes in the House. You might say that is enough to win, but it was brought up under suspension, which means we need two-thirds majority, and that day that would have been 286 votes; so we failed by 13 votes to get the necessary majority, the two-thirds majority, to pass it.

Both of those bills were our bills, the Senate 2754 and the House bill 5526. And along with the Castle-DeGette bill and the alternative bill, which would not result in the destruction of embryos, our bill got 100 percent of the Senators. That is, 100 Senators voting for the bill. It is interesting that there were 63 Senators that voted for both of these bills. They included Senator ARLEN SPECTER, who introduced both of these bills in the Senate; and it also included Senators REID, HARKIN, KENNEDY, CLINTON, OBAMA, and SCHUMER. Those Senators voted for all of these bills.

We have now passed, essentially, the Castle-DeGette bill again in the House with 253 ayes and 174 noes, and that is nowhere near close to the number that it would take to override a presidential veto. And in the last Congress, the President vetoed the Castle-DeGette bill, and he has promised to and certainly will veto it this time should it get to his desk. This is the bill that the Senate will be voting on next week. So that is why we are on the floor today talking about this bill. By the way, our bill is 322, and it has been cosponsored so far by 34, truly bipartisan support for which I am very pleased.

I thought to begin this discussion of embryonic stem cells we might go back to the basic physiology of what we are talking about here. And the first chart I have here shows half of the reproductive tract in a woman. There is another half to this on the other side, a mirror image of this. Most things in our body are mirror images. Things like the liver are not and the stomach. We have two arms and two eyes, and the lady has two oviducts and two ovaries and

so forth. And this shows the stages of development of the embryo. And, of course, what we will be talking about is not what happens in the body but what happens in a petri dish in the laboratory. But the embryo goes through the same stages of development in the petri dish in the laboratory as it does in the oviduct of the prospective mother.

Here we have the ovary, and it contains a very large number of primary cells, which when they develop will become ova. And once a month typically, every 4 weeks, typically, one of the ova matures and the little follicle then ruptures and the ovum comes out. And it is interesting that the ovary is not connected to the rest of the reproductive tract of the female. But there is a funnel-like thing, and we see only a part of the funnel here. This part and this part goes clearly around it. And it is called the infundibulum, and this process is called ovulation. The egg now is released from the mature follicle, and it is usually picked up by the infundibulum and directed into the oviduct. On occasion it may not be and it may escape out into the body cavity or the celium, which simply means the cavity. And these sperm, millions of which were released in the uterus and they make their way into the fallopian tubes, and some of those sperm actually get out into the body cavity. And this egg that is not picked up by the infundibulum may be out of the body cavity and it may be fertilized by the sperm that gets there, and this is called an ectopic pregnancy. And it is very bad news for the mother and the embryo, and it has to be terminated with surgery. But usually, most of the time, the ovum is picked up by the fallopian tube and it begins its way down the fallopian tube.

Notice that fertilization takes place, and that is when the clock starts running, called DZero. Fertilization takes place well up into the oviduct. And there is a several-day journey. You see them here, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, on down. And the fertilized egg now is called a zygote, and it begins to divide. And here you see it is at a two-cell stage, and a little later we will have some charts that show what can happen at this two-cell stage and even later. But frequently these two cells will simply separate until you have two cells that look like the original one you started with here, and that is what we called identical twins. Then they will make their way down the fallopian tube together and implant in an interesting way in the uterus as we will see later. And then the two cells divide and develop into four cells and then the four cells into eight cells. And we will come back and talk about this eight-cell stage because that is the time at which some procedures are done in the petri dish which promise that we can get true embryonic stem cells from embryos without harming the embryo.

Well, the cell then goes on to divide beyond the eight-cell stage. And you

now have a morula, a ball of cells which may be a fairly large number of cells, maybe 100 or fewer cells. And then it goes on to divide into a very large number of cells, and that is the gastrula stage. The morula and the blastula and then on to the gastrula down here. The gastrula stage develops into three germ layers.

The next chart shows a little more clearly what is happening. And here it started with a zygote and it skipped all of the stages that we talked about here, the two-cell, four-cell, eight-cell stage and so forth. And it goes directly now down to the blastocyst and then on down to the gastrula. And then the gastrula, we see the three germ layers developing.

And notice that most of what we have here is not going to end up as an embryo. What is going to end up as an embryo is this little bit of material here, and the rest of it is going to end up as supporting tissue, the amnion and the chorion and the fetal contribution to the placenta and so forth. But at this stage, just about the time the egg is implanting, as you saw, and by "implanting" we mean it connects itself to the uterus, this cell is implanting at about the time that the three germ layers are developed.

From these three germ layers will develop all of the tissues of the body. These three germ layers are called the outer germ layer, or the ectoderm; the middle germ layer, or the mesoderm; and the inner germ layer, or the endoderm.

From the ectoderm develops our skin, the integument, which is defined as an organ. It is about the biggest organ in the body, actually, and a very complex and interesting one. And then the brain and spinal cord all of our nervous system develops from the ectoderm.

From the mesoderm develops most of the mass of our body, the muscles and the bones and the blood. Here you see the blood, which is a tissue that develops from the mesoderm. From the endoderm develops the lining of the gut and the lining of the lungs and so forth, although the mass of the endodermal tissue is nowhere near as large as the mesoderm and the ectoderm. In some organs they play a very essential role.

It is interesting that when you have a cancer and it metastasizes, it metastasizes usually only two tissues of common embryonic origin. What that means is that if you have a cancer on mesodermal tissue, when these cells break loose and float through the lymph system, it will metastasize only to tissues that develop from mesoderm. So it is very interesting that all through the life of the person, these tissues retain some of the original characteristics of these three germ layers. And the body cells, the T cells and so forth are programmed to know the difference between these body tissues.

I mentioned T cells. I shouldn't do that without explaining a little bit of

what they are. Very early in our embryonic development, there are some unique cells that will end up in the blood. Some unique cells are developed, and they are now imprinted with who you are, and this is very early in development. And it is their role all through your life after that to keep track of who you are and identify any invader that is not you. So if a virus or a bacterium or something like that gets in, the T cells immediately detect that as being foreign and they now alert the leukocytes, which are the white blood cells, which have phagocytic, which means they can envelope and ingest. These organisms have phagocytic activity, alert them that that is an enemy and you need to take him out. And that is called our response system to infections and so forth. And, by the way, if you have a little pus pocket, that is the remains of thousands, maybe millions of these leukocytes that have come to do battle for you, and they have died in the process. But not to worry. Your bone marrow and lymph system are making a whole lot more lymphocytes.

Sometimes these T cells get confused, and it is not really clear to them what is you and what is not you. And sometimes they will falsely identify some of your tissues as being foreign to you, and then the leukocytes will come in and attack the other body defenses will come in and attack these tissues.

□ 1730

We refer to these diseases, and there are a whole long list of them, as being autoimmune diseases. I have one of those diseases, and many, many people have that. Some types of arthritis is an autoimmune disease. You have the arthritis because your T cells have inappropriately identified these joint tissues in your body as not being used, so they are now being attacked by the body defenses.

I want to look at just one more slide and then call on a colleague of mine, Dr. GINGREY, who has joined me in filing this bill.

This is a little illustration of what happens with monozygotic twins. Mono means one, and you saw what the zygote was. That is the fertilized ovum. Monozygotic twins, we call them identical twins. It begins with the fertilized egg, the zygote, the two-cell stage, then it may develop to two inner masses. Actually, the division can occur at the two-cell stage. The division, we have some reason to believe it can occur as the two inner cell mass stages. These will later develop into the three germ layers we talked about.

You can differentiate when that division occurred by how the babies present themselves at birth, whether they are in two amnions or in a common amnion. They, of course, should always be in a common chorion. The chorion is the big tough sac on the outside. The amnion is the thinner sac on the inside filled with the fluid called the amniotic fluid that protects the baby during its development.

I would like to note, by the way, that one of these two identical twins is a clone. I didn't think the sky was going to fall when we talked about cloning, because nature has been doing it for a very long time. But sometimes we should let nature do things and not mimic or interfere in what nature is doing, and I understand the concerns relative to cloning. But it is just of interest to note that nature has been doing this for a very long time.

Dr. GINGREY has joined us. Let me now yield to him.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is going to be like two discussions, one from the professor and the other one from maybe his first year master's program student. Although I have a M.D., Dr. BARTLETT, of course, is a Ph.D. physiologist, and as he explains this, it is compelling, the evidence that he gives.

Sometimes I get a little lost in the science myself, but I think the main thing to know about the bill that he has introduced, and introduced in the last Congress and introduced again in the 110th this year, H.R. 322 is an alternative way to obtain almost totally potential, totipotent embryonic, almost embryonic stem cells, without getting into this moral-ethical dilemma of the question of are you for life at its earliest and its most advanced stages, are you pro-life or pro-choice. This is a debate that will go on probably for long after we are all gone and other people have taken our places on both sides of the aisle.

But what I like about the Bartlett bill, H.R. 322, is it says, Mr. President, we don't have to divide the country over this issue. It has been divisive. The President made a very difficult decision back in I think August of 2001 when there was this call for Federal funding for stem cell research. Before that, there had been none, or none on embryonic stem cell, let me say. There had been some research on adults in bone marrow and cord blood and things like that, and I am sure Dr. BARTLETT has talked about that.

But the President has said, look, we will allow embryonic stem cell funding by the John Q. Public taxpayer on these existing stem cell lines that had been indeed obtained from a living human embryo, little life in their earliest forms, that were obtained from these fertility clinics that were considered extra or throwaway or whatever. So the President, I forget the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of research that the Federal Government has funded through the National Institutes of Health and other agencies, but it is substantial, but he did not want to fund any more research on new destruction of life.

So that is where we have been for these last few years, until Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. CASTLE in the House passed their bill that would allow the use of the little embryos from the fertility clinics.

So I want to commend Dr. BARTLETT, because what he says is that maybe it is true, maybe it is true that the embryonic stem cell in its earliest form has more potential than the adult stem cells. The adult stem cells are multipotent, but not pluripotent, and certainly not totipotent. So what Dr. BARTLETT has done in his bill is say, look, there are other ways.

Madam Speaker, there is a doctor at Wake Forest University and just recently he did some research and reported in a very respected medical journal of being able to obtain cells from amniotic fluid as early as 10 to 12 weeks of a pregnancy.

Now, that is not a true embryonic cell, but it is getting pretty darn close to it. It is getting darn close to it. I would be very interested in hearing what Dr. BARTLETT says about if you compare the potential of those cells in amniotic fluid that you can obtain when a woman, let's say for genetic diagnosis she is 10 to 12 weeks pregnant, she is over the age of 35, she has concerned about the increased risk of Down Syndrome, and she wants some assurance that that baby, her baby, doesn't have Down Syndrome. So that is why the amniotic fluid is obtained, to get some of those cells to know the exact genetic makeup of that child.

But there are lots of extra cells that could be then used with the patient's consent without harming anything, certainly without destruction of any living embryo.

So this is why I as kind of a practical-minded former OB-GYN physician, who has not researched, who never published a paper, who didn't work at one of the great medical centers in this country, but I did go to a wonderful medical school, the Medical College of Georgia in Augusta, and I did my residency there in obstetrics and gynecology, and then went out and practiced for 26 years and delivered a lot of babies, and I feel I know of what I speak.

But what I want to do, and the purpose of me being here tonight and sharing this time with Dr. BARTLETT, is to say we don't have to fight about this. We got lots of things we can fight about.

We are fighting about the conduct of the war right now. We have people in this body that say it was the wrong thing, and then other people say, no, no, it wasn't the wrong thing, but the thing is wrong, and they are arguing about how we have conducted that. We will have and are having a fair debate and difference of opinion.

But this is one that, because of what is in the Bartlett bill, H.R. 322, we don't really have to fight about it. We don't have to get ugly about it. And most importantly, we don't have to destroy any human life in getting these nearly totally potential, almost embryonic stem cells.

Of course, Dr. BARTLETT will want to discuss further, I think, that as part of his bill there are techniques that you

actually can obtain an embryonic stem cell without destroying the embryo, by doing a biopsy technique.

So that is why I strongly support his bill. We all, everybody in this House and in the other Chamber, the other body, our heart goes out to the Michael J. Foxes of the world, the Christopher Reeves of the world and the folks that are not famous that may be members of our own family. I have heard my colleagues come down and speak in the well compellingly about members of their own family. Our esteemed colleague from Rhode Island, a wonderful Member of this body, who, as a paraplegic, when he talks, people listen, obviously, on both sides of the aisle.

So we want help. We want help ASAP. But I don't think we have to divide our country, we don't have to divide ourselves, we don't have to destroy any human life.

As I kind of sum up and close and turn it back over to the real expert, I just want to say, Madam Speaker, that it is suggested there are extra and there are so many, 400,000 or whatever, just sitting around waiting to be utilized for their embryonic cells and they are going to be thrown away. It is really not true, and we all know that.

We all know that many of the Snowflake Babies have been up here in Washington, in some instances twins that were adopted as embryos and implanted into a mom who couldn't have a baby before that, and in some instances had more than one and had two. I have held them in my arms. We call them the Snowflake Babies, but they are beautiful little toddlers for a lot of infertile couples. So there are no extra babies. There are no throwaways.

With that, I yield back to my colleague. I appreciate him giving me a little time to join him and say hoorah for the work he is doing on H.R. 322.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Thank you very much. I am very appreciative of the contribution that Dr. GINGREY is making. Being a physician and having delivered a very large number of babies, he obviously brings a level of authenticity and credibility to this discussion.

On this chart, we have another couple of sequences which shows—the previous one we looked at showed the development of identical twins—this one shows the production of paternal twins. The mother may slough two eggs. As a matter of fact, with the in vitro fertilization, since we aren't sure that any one of them is going to be potent to implant properly, frequently the doctor will place several in the uterus and more than one may implant. I have a good colleague here, DANA ROHR-ABACHER, whose wife had three babies. That is nice. That gets the bottle feeding and diaper changing all over pretty quickly, doesn't it?

But this is what happens when the mother sloughs more than one egg naturally. Both of these eggs will be fertilized, because there are millions of sperm there, and they start to divide,

and this is what is going down that little C-shaped fallopian tube in the uterus that we saw before.

Then at the blastula stage, it gets down to the uterus, and usually they will be somewhat separated and they will implant some little distance from each other, so when they present at birth the doctor will know immediately they are fraternal twins, because they have separate amniotic sacs and separate placentas, just two different babies, one attached to one side of the uterus and the other perhaps attached to the other side of the uterus.

But sometimes if they implant very close together in the uterus, they will develop with a fused chorionic sac which may mimic the single chorionic sac that is produced with identical twins. Then, of course, you will know whether they are identical or not, whether they look alike or not; and if you aren't really certain of that, you can do DNA to determine if they are identical twins.

□ 1745

Madam Speaker, President Bush appointed a council on bioethics to look at this whole embryonic stem cell debate. When he came to office, of course, money was being spent on a number of embryonic stem cell lines, and all of those stem cell lines were produced by destroying embryos, and the President was faced with a dilemma, was it right to take one life because when you destroy an embryo you are taking a life, to hopefully help another. His own personal ethics would not permit him to do this, so he set up a council on bioethics to determine were there techniques where one could get embryonic stem cells without killing embryos or harming embryos.

This is from page 25 in this white paper. It said, "Thus, apparently normal children have been born following removal of one or two blastomeres from the six to eight cell embryo. However, long-term studies to determine whether this procedure produces subtle or later developing injury in children born following PGD," preimplantation genetic diagnosis, "have been recommended and are sorely needed."

Well, maybe we need those studies, but I think nature through the years has conducted a very large number of studies for us. I want to show you this identical twin slide because in identical twins, half the cells of the embryo are taken away, and each half produces a perfectly normal child as far as we can tell, and it has been going on for roughly 8,000 years of recorded history. No one has ever suggested there is anything deficient in an identical twin.

As a matter of fact, when President Clinton appointed a commission to look at this, it was an identical twin who chaired the commission, and I asked him when he was on the Hill here if he felt less a person because he was only half the original embryo. Of course, that is a silly question because he certainly doesn't feel any less a person. But that is what many people

would have you believe. That somehow taking a cell or two from this early embryo, if you take two cells from an eight-cell embryo, the result will be three-fourths of a person because you took a fourth of his cells away. Well, no identical twin feels half a person because the other half of that original embryo produced his or her identical twin.

So one would be enormously surprised if this had any effect because, as I say, in 8,000 years of recorded history with millions and millions of identical twins produced, no one has ever hinted that there is any deficiency in an identical twin because they shared the cells from an original embryo with their mate.

It may be some time before stem cell lines can be reliably derived from single cells. These are the single cells that are taken out up here, extracted from early embryos, and in ways that do no harm to the embryo.

Now medicine has marched on, and as I will explain, we have the evidence that we can do this. The initial success of the Verlinksy group efforts raises the future possibility that pluripotent stem cells, which means the *pluri* is many. It is not totipotent. Totipotent is totally potent. That is the cell can produce anything and everything, including another embryo.

When I first started exploring this potential, I had the nagging concern that the single cell I took from that early embryo would be totipotent and what I was dealing with was just another embryo, in other words I was king of making identical twins. But I am very pleased that no one out there believes that the cells taken from the 8-cell stage are totipotent.

What this means is you shouldn't be able to get an identical twin from something beyond the 8-cell stage, and clearly you can, so there are some things going on here that we may not be totally familiar with. But there are a lot of things going on in the body that we can't explain.

As an example, if you remove part of your liver, and there are very few organs in the body that have this potential, but the liver will now regenerate what you have taken out. The question I have always asked myself, as long ago as 50 years ago when I first had these courses, no, 60 years ago now when I first had these courses, how did those cells in the liver know, millions of them, how did they know enough was enough, that the liver was now reconstituted to its original size so they could quit dividing. I have asked that question of current physiologists, and no one knows the answer to that.

And if you have a bone broken, in the healing process you have a callus developing on that bone. There is a thickening of the bone, and then gradually that is taken away and the bone is returned pretty much to its original shape. How do those cells know they have taken enough away? Or how do they know that they have developed

enough of a callus to strengthen the bone until it is well calcified, until it is strong enough.

What we are going to be talking about is this and a number of other techniques that are included in the legislation that I talked about, H.R. 322, and the one that was passed in the last Congress.

The next slide shows some of the techniques that were reported by the President's Council on Bioethics as potentially offering the hope that we could get embryonic stem cells from an embryo without killing the embryo.

Our first depiction here is normal fertilization. The cells divide and grow in the mother. One of the last divisions is what we call a meiotic division. The usual division is a mitotic division. Before the mitotic division, the chromosomes divide so when the cells separate, each cell has the normal number of chromosomes called the diploid number, and the single unit of chromosomes is called the haploid number.

Well, obviously if you are going to have a human being who has the normal number of chromosomes, you have to end up with half as many of those chromosomes in the egg and half as many in the sperm, and that is accomplished by a process known as meiosis. So in the egg and in the sperm cell, there are only the haploid number of chromosomes, only half the full complement of chromosomes, and they now join in the egg. There is quite a miraculous process that occurs there. There may be millions of sperms trying to fertilize the egg, but essentially instantaneously when one cell makes it into the egg, then the covering of the egg becomes absolutely impervious to any other sperm. If that wasn't true, you would end up with two sperm getting in, and then you would have triploid, or three, and that would be fatal for humans. Trisomy 21, for instance, is what happens to a human when just one of those chromosomes, mongolism, when only one of those chromosomes is three in nature, and sometimes that happens in the division of the cells, and that is called trisomy 21 or mongolism.

It is very interesting in plants that many replications of the chromosome, or polyploid, is a very beneficial effect. The flowers get bigger with better colors, and that is one of the things that plant breeders do is use a chemical to produce polyploid, bigger and better plants, and some that aren't any good but you can just discard them. That is how we have gotten many of miracle crops, by polyploid.

The second depiction here is of cloning. In cloning, you take an egg cell and you take the nucleus out of the egg cell so now you have an egg cell without a nucleus. And then you have a donor cell, and you can get the nucleus from this donor cell into the egg two different ways. One, you can fuse the two and the nucleus will then migrate to the egg; or you can simply take the nucleus out of the donor cell and put it in the egg.

Now all of the controlling material in the egg is not in the nucleus. There are a number of cytoplasmic factors that control what the genes, what the chromosomes and the nucleus does. So this goes on to what appears to be a fairly normal birth.

In parthenogenesis, that is an interesting one, in parthenogenesis, meiosis does not occur and the egg retains its diploid number of chromosomes and the egg goes on and divides. And some animals, by the way, reproduce by parthenogenesis. That rarely happens in humans. Some animals reproduce almost exclusively by parthenogenesis.

The next slide is another depiction of some of these same techniques, and it goes just a little further. Here we have the classical development and embryonic stem cell derivation. What they do here is when you get to this blastocyst area, you have two choices. One, you either implant it or freeze it to keep it for implantation later; or you destroy it and get your embryonic stem cells. This is classic technique for getting embryonic stem cells. This was the technique that the President had ethical concerns about which is why he issued his executive order which said that Federal money could be used to support research using the embryonic stem cell lines in existence at that time, what, 60 or more, now down to 20 or 22, and we knew that they would eventually run out, and now we are faced with a crisis because what do we do, these stem cell lines are running out. There is a big hope in the medical community that we can get some fairly dramatic cures from embryonic stem cells.

Here are embryonic stem cells from a single blastomere. This is what we have been talking about. You take a single blastomere cell from the embryo, and you can implant what is remaining. They have done that more than 2,000 times. They have done what is called a PGD. It started in England. There are a number of those labs in our country, and the parents would like to know whether or not their baby is going to have a genetic defect.

So they take a single cell out and they do a genetic diagnosis. If there is no genetic defect, they implant the remaining cells in the mother, and more than 2,000 times now we have had what appears to be a perfectly normal baby. Indeed, the big surprise would be if it wasn't a perfectly normal baby because in nature in producing normal identical twins, half the cells are taken away and nobody argues that identical twins are not normal people.

Then the process of nuclear transfer, and one of the techniques that is suggested here is a modification of that, modification of that cloning, and this is altered nuclear transfer. This is the modification.

In this one they make sure that you are not going to have a clone because they deactivate one of the genes. CDX2 I think it is called there. They deactivate one of the genes so that it will

simply develop into a cell mass with no organization. You can now get from that cell mass the cells that you wish, but there is no organization and it is not an embryo. You can see some obvious objections to this. You are just producing a freak and why would you want to do that to a perfectly normal zygote that you started with.

The next chart shows this altered nuclear transfer in a little more detail. We have seen this one before. Altered nuclear transfer is where you knock out the gene for normal development so when you have taken the nucleus from the egg and replaced that with a nucleus from the donor cell, you now have knocked out the gene in this nucleus for normal development, so you are simply going to get a growth of cells. It is not going to be an embryo, and there obviously some ethical questions about this, but this is being debated.

This is an oocyte-assisted reprogramming. What this says is that in the oocyte, and I mentioned the factors that are out in the cytoplasm, and if you intensify those and let them work, they will assist in this and it increases the genes for embryonic stem cell growth without producing an organized embryo.

And this is the technique which I suggested, embryo biopsy. I went to NIH way before the President issued his executive order, and having had a course in advanced embryology nearly 50 years ago, and recognizing what identical twins were, it occurred to me you ought to be able to take a cell from the early embryo without hurting the embryo.

□ 1800

I asked the NIH researchers when they had an open house out there one day while the President was making up his mind, and they invited Members of Congress and staff to come out. I do not remember any other Members of Congress. There was a lot of staff there.

I asked them should this not be possible? They said, well, it certainly should be possible. In fact, you know, it is certainly easier just to take the embryo and disaggregate, they call it. That means stir it all up. Disaggregate it and take your embryonic stem cells from what grows from that.

There is another interesting proposal of how to get embryonic stem cells without killing embryos. If you deal with in vitro fertilization, you produce a number of embryos and you have eight of them that you have thawed out and you are going to look at them to see which ones look strong enough to be fertilized to place in the woman.

There are some of these embryos that will not make it. They appear to be alive, but they will not go on and divide. So, in just a little while, they are going to decompose and die, and the proponents of this technique argue that they are a bit like the brain-dead person, that is, an individual that is

not going to make it but the parts. We take body parts from brain-dead people for transplant. So they argue you ought to be able to get good cells from an embryo that is not going to divide any further. I have several slides, and I did not bring all of them, which show the criteria which are fairly reproducible and verifiable that the embryo is, in fact, dead—because you would not want somebody to say, gee, I think that embryo is going to die so I am going to take it because I would like to get an embryonic stem cell line from that embryo.

The next slide shows a bit of an expansion on this. Embryonic stem cell assisted reprogramming, and the acronyms, particularly DOD and much of the other professional societies have lots of acronyms. I guess that is so they appear more erudite and you cannot figure out what they are saying.

Differentiation using cell proteins, this is the assisted development I mentioned because this cell suite, this is from the cytoplasm, and this contains factors that controls what happens in the nucleus. They turn on genes and turn off genes and so forth during the development of the embryo. You can modify that.

Differentiation, a new term, should not use these terms without describing what they are. When you start out with the cell mass and the developing embryo, so forth, those cells are undifferentiated, they are all the same. They then begin the differentiation process where you have an ectoderm, a mesoderm, and an endoderm. Then it goes on to differentiate from that. You can get bone from mesoderm. You can get muscle from mesoderm. You can get blood cells from mesoderm. So the differentiation goes on from that.

Then there are postnatal tissues, and these are the tissues from which we can get adult stem cells. It might be worth just a moment to mention the dialogue that is going on between the enthusiasts for adult stem cells and the proponents of embryonic stem cell research.

Most of the medical applications have been made from adult stem cells, and that is because we have been working with adult stem cells for more than 3 decades. It just takes a while for something to go from the laboratory to the hospital, and we have had that time for the adult stem cells. We have not had that time for embryonic stem cells because we have been working on them for only a few years.

Now, this permits some people who are very zealous for protection of the embryo to say, gee, we really should not be looking at embryonic stem cell research because all of the contributions so far have been from adult stem cells and so, therefore, why would you want to go this route because presumably all the applications in the future are also going to come from adult stem cells.

That may be true but I will tell you that there is nobody that I know of in

the professional community who believes that that ought to be true. These embryonic stem cells may be like the rambunctious teenager. They can be somewhat uncontrollable, and in some of the early experiments, they have gone on to produce cancers and growths and so forth, and who knows what the ultimate will be.

But I will tell you, and you know from what you see in the papers and hear on television and so forth that there are a number of people who believe that diseases like Parkinson's disease and diabetes and spinal cord injuries and so forth could maybe be cured with the application of embryonic stem cell research and medical developments.

It is true that theoretically, philosophically, there ought to be more applications from embryonic stem cells just because of what they are. They are pluripotent cells. They can make any and every cell in the body. We have some adult stem cells, and we generally get them from the bone marrow, the blood, and there are stem cells with a variety of blood cells that are produced and you can sometimes trick them into believing they are not what they are so they can also make some other tissues.

The next slide shows the little schematic on the dead embryo, and what this shows is that you can tell—and these are reproducible and verifiable—you can tell that an embryo is probably—well, not probably—is not going to make it, and then the argument is that you ought to be able to take cells from that embryo ethically. Of course, the other argument would be if the embryo is about to die, why would I want a stem cell line from cells that are suspect.

Clearly, clearly, if we can make the altered nuclear transfer work, where you can take the donor cell which is a cell from the patient, if you can make embryonic stem cells from that, that is the route we want to go because then the organ you are making, whatever you are making for that person, is going to be them, and you can implant it in them. There is not going to be any rejection. If it comes from any other source, you are going to have a rejection phenomena, but we have developed clinical techniques for handling that. There are lots of people with organ transplants, and they lead productive, comfortable lives for quite a number of years.

When I first started this discussion, we conferenced with a lot of individuals, and one of those was a representative of the Conference of Catholic Bishops. Sometimes in life, you see something or somebody says something, you say to yourself, gee, why did I not think of that; it is so obvious and so right and so productive. That happened in this dialogue.

We were talking about taking cells from the early embryo that would not hurt the embryo, but then you get the idea that, gee, it might. You can make

the argument and certainly should not because you can take half the cells away in identical twins and obviously it has not hurt the embryo at all, so why should taking a cell out of the embryo make any, yeah, I know, but it just might. So you need to do some work with that to make sure it does not hurt the embryos. There is always an outside chance that the person lives to be 90 and they determine some defect that was as a result of taking the cell out earlier.

So the suggestion was made by Mr. Dortlinger that, gee, the first thing you do with that cell you take out is to make a repair kit. Wow, why did I not think about that? It is obviously such a right thing to do. What you do to that cell now is to make your replacement, which by the way is what parents are hoping to sort of do when they freeze umbilical cord blood. Now, those are not embryonic stem cells in umbilical cord blood. They are adult. So when the baby is born it is an adult. As a matter of fact, the day you are born is the day you start to die. Things start to go downhill from the day you are born. So these are adult stem cells, but they have characteristics that may be more amenable to alterations, to modifications than adult stem cells taken from a 50-year-old.

By the way, there has been a new technique which some heralded, now we do not need to think about embryonic stem cells because you can take amniotic fluid, and as the baby is growing from the earliest stages on, but it has to be in amnion before you can get these cells in the amniotic fluid. You can get some embryonic stem cells there, and so a big push was made, gee, let us stop talking about embryonic stem cell research because now we have got these stem cells from amniotic fluid.

But the person who discovered that made the observation that this was complementary to embryonic stem cells and should not be considered in place of embryonic stem cells. It is certainly a good place to get cells that are more easily reprogrammed to believe that they are not what they are at that stage of development, but he said that it should be considered complementary to embryonic stem cells and not in place of stem cells.

Well, the Senate is going to vote on this in a few days now; that is, they are going to vote on the Castle-DeGette bill. It will certainly pass, and I think they are voting on exactly the same bill. So it does not even need to go to conference. It will then go to the President, and the President will do what he did in the last Congress. He will veto the bill.

So here we will be with only a few embryonic stem cell lines running out. They are all contaminated with mouse feeder cells, and so they may or may not be amenable to actual therapy, but in any event, these stem cell lines do run out. With the enormous potential that many people believe embryonic

stem cells have, we will be in a situation where there is only a few embryonic stem cell lines which are running out and a public out there which is demanding and they come to our office. One of those compelling things are these kids with this big thing in their body like a hockey puck which is pushing insulin because they have juvenile diabetes, and they are very brittle and they have to trickle that in little by little during the day to maintain the status quo.

So here we will be with embryonic stem cell lines running out, with a cry from the public and the professional part of the public that we need to move on with this. My hope is that when the President has vetoed this bill, the Castle-DeGette bill, he will, he did last time and he will again, that then they pass our bill which was passed 100-0 in the Senate last year, by 273 votes in this House. In fact, they got more votes than the one that is being sent on to the President from this House. So, hopefully, that bill will come up next and can move to the President's desk, and he will certainly sign that bill and we can get on with ethical embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all of our listeners out there who have a Representative that they believe may not be supportive of this, would they please contact that Representative and urge them to support this bill. It will provide ethical embryonic stem cell research. Neither I nor any of the others know what the ultimate result of this will be, but I will tell you the potential for clinical cures and application because of embryonic stem cells being what they are has to be greater than adult stem cells.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that we can move this clock very quickly because there are a lot of people out there that need this kind of help.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 985, WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (during the Special Order of Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-48) on the resolution (H. Res. 239) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 985) to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify which disclosures of information are protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in non-disclosure policies, forms, and agreements to the effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. SCHMIDT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALLEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 342. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse".

H.R. 544. An act to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".

H.R. 584. An act to designate the Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

817. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Lending Maturity Limit and Other Financial Services (RIN: 3133-AD30) received March 8, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

818. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, OGC, FERC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in Transmission Service [Docket Nos. RM05-17-000 and RM05-25-000; Order No. 890] received March 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

819. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-10-AD; Amendment 39-14621; AD 2003-21-09 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

820. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23936; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-215-AD; Amendment 39-14590; AD 2006-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

821. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747-300, 747-400, 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23819; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-223-AD; Amendment 39-14588; AD 2006-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

822. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada (PWC) PW535A Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-24117; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-07-AD; Amendment 39-14570; AD 2006-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

823. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Model AT-501 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23647; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-06-AD; Amendment 39-14564; AD 2002-11-05 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

824. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 Airplanes and Model Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23215; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-212-AD; Amendment 39-14596; AD 2006-10-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

825. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BURKHART GROB LUFT-UNDRUMFAHRT GmbH & Co. KG, Model G 103 C Twin III SL Sailplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20768; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-16-AD; Amendment 39-14554; AD 2006-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

826. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-92A Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-24875; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-03-AD; Amendment 39-14618; AD 2006-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

827. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness

Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP Model Galaxy and Model Gulfstream 200 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23478; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-175-AD; Amendment 39-14602; AD 2006-10-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

828. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. T5311A, T5311B, T5313A, T5317A, T5317A-1, and T5317B Series Turboshaft Engines and Lycoming Former Military T53-L11B, T53-L-11D, T53-L-13B, T53-L-13B/D, and T53-L-703 Series Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-72-AD; Amendment 39-14620; AD 2006-11-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

829. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials Regulations: Transportation of Compressed Oxygen, Other Oxidizing Gases and Chemical Oxygen Generators on Aircraft [Docket No. RSPA-04-17664 (HM-224B)] (RIN: 2137-AD33) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

830. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of the Class B Airspace Area; Atlanta, GA [Docket No. FAA-2006-25831; Airspace Docket No. 06-AWA-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

831. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Re-Designation of VOR Federal Airway V-431; Alaska [Docket No. FAA-2006-25186; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-18] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

832. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Sheridan, WY [Docket No. FAA-2006-25038; Airspace Docket No. 06-ANM-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

833. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Using Agency for Restricted Area R-2202, Big Delta, AK. [Docket No. FAA-2006-26133; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-33] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

834. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Controlling Agency and Using Agency for Restricted Areas R-6608A, B, C; Quantico, VA. [Docket No. FAA-2006-26351; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASO-12] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

835. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kokhanok, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25180; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

836. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Iliamna, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25182; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-21] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

837. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Class E Airspace; Cedar Springs, GA [Docket No. FAA-2006-26155; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASO-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

838. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Hooper Bay, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-24675; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

839. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Perryville, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-24748; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

840. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Homer, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25762; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

841. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Kodiak, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25763; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-26] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

842. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; St. Michael, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25825; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-27] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

843. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Tok Junction, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-25826; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-28] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

844. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Restricted Area 5601F; Fort Still, OK [Docket No. FAA-2005-22680; Airspace Docket No. 05-ASW-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

845. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Castle Airport, Atwater, CA [Docket No. FAA-2006-25671; Airspace Docket No. 06-AWP-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

846. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Alaskan High Altitude Reporting Points, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-26244; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-36] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

847. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Eastman, GA; Correction [Docket No. FAA-2006-25270; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASO-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS (FL): Committee on Rules. House Resolution 239. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 985) to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify which disclosures of information are protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements to the effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-48). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of March 12, 2007]

H.R. 1362. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than March 14, 2007.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, and Ms. FOXX):

H.R. 1486. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide parental choice for those students that attend schools that are in need of improvement and have been identified for restructuring; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1487. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to make available additional amounts to address funding shortfalls in the State Children's Health Insurance Program for fiscal year 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. KIND, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 1488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance to include educational assistance provided to

dependents of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARROW (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1489. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to eliminate the remainder of the funding shortfalls in the State Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) for fiscal year 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. UPTON) (both by request):

H.R. 1490. A bill to provide for a presumption of service-connectedness for certain claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to preserve affordable housing in multifamily housing units which are sold or exchanged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1492. A bill to provide for the establishment at the National Science Foundation of a program to promote and assist the teaching of inventiveness and innovation; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MACK, Mr. KUH of New York, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 1493. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to public transportation agencies, over-the-road bus operators, railroads, and other certain entities to improve security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 1494. A bill to improve the process for the development of needed pediatric medical devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1495. A bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1496. A bill to provide incentives for pharmaceutical companies, biotechnology companies, and medical device companies to invest in research and development with respect to antibiotic drugs, antivirals, diagnostic tests, and vaccines that may be used to identify, treat, or prevent serious and life-threatening infectious diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 1497. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to extend its protections to plants illegally harvested outside of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the transportation fringe benefit to bicycle commuters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the harbor maintenance tax certain commercial cargo loaded or unloaded at United States ports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 1500. A bill to provide for the stabilization of prices for gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1501. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the fee for collecting specimens for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FALLIN (for herself and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1502. A bill to treat certain payments made by Edmond, Oklahoma, as satisfying its obligations under the water storage control for Lake Arcadia, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1503. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Avra/Black Wash Reclamation and Riparian Restoration Project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LoBIONDO (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 1504. A bill to ensure the continuation and improvement of coastal restoration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LOEBACK (for himself and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 1505. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the "James A. Leach Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KIRK, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BONO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK,

Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HODES, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1506. A bill to increase fuel economy standards for automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STARK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 1507. A bill to ensure that proper information gathering and planning are undertaken to secure the preservation and recovery of the salmon and steelhead of the Columbia River Basin in a manner that protects and enhances local communities, ensures effective expenditure of Federal resources, and maintains reasonably priced, reliable power, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to seek scientific analysis of Federal efforts to restore salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1508. A bill to reform certain provisions of section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to make compliance with that section more efficient, with the goal of maintaining United States capital market global competitiveness; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1510. A bill to require enhanced disclosure to consumers regarding the consequences of making only minimum required payments in the repayment of credit card debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide relief with respect to rent and mortgage payments for members of the reserve components who are called to active duty and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit to lessors for payments foregone by reason of such relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. KAGEN):

H.R. 1512. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for compensation to States incarcerating undocumented aliens charged with a felony or two or more misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and support for the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H. Res. 240. A resolution urging all member countries of the International Commission of

the International Tracing Service (ITS) who have yet to ratify the May 2006 Amendments to the 1955 Bonn Accords Treaty, to expedite the ratification process to allow for open access to the Holocaust archives located at Bad Arolsen, Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 241. A resolution urging multilateral financial institutions to cancel completely and immediately Haiti's debts to such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 40: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 63: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 111: Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. RENZI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WU, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 140: Mr. POE.
H.R. 241: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 274: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 281: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 285: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 303: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 358: Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 395: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 413: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 464: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 472: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 473: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 477: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 511: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MICA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 545: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 549: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 553: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 562: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 566: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 612: Mr. HALL of New York and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 678: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 698: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 727: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 736: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 751: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 769: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 821: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 880: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 901: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 910: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 938: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 972: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 980: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 997: Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 998: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 1014: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. JINDAL, and Ms. FALLIN.
 H.R. 1022: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 1049: Mr. MACK and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1061: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1076: Mr. FILNER and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 1093: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1104: Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 1110: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1132: Mr. STARK, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 1137: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. PORTER.
 H.R. 1150: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 1153: Mr. POE.
 H.R. 1188: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1217: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 1238: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1246: Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 1278: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1279: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 1280: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. MURTHA.
 H.R. 1282: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 1283: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1284: Mr. HARE.
 H.R. 1303: Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 1307: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1314: Mr. CAMPBELL of California and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 1324: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1330: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 1335: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1342: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 1365: Mr. FEENEY.
 H.R. 1366: Mr. FEENEY.
 H.R. 1371: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. HASTERT.
 H.R. 1391: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1413: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1430: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1448: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.J. Res. 37: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. CANTOR.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. WYNN and Ms. HIRONO.
 H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. HARMAN.
 H. Res. 55: Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H. Res. 107: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HARE.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
 H. Res. 123: Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 146: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 196: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H. Res. 221: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 222: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARE, and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H. Res. 224: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H. Res. 230: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SIRES and Mr. FORTUÑO.
 H. Res. 231: Ms. FOXX.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Res. 106: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.